

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 27, 1982

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Reverend Dr. W. Jean Richardson, moderator of the general assembly, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Knoxville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, the Supreme Architect and Creator, the Loving Father, the Sovereign Lord of all the universe, how excellent is Thy name in all the Earth.

We acknowledge Your dominion over us. You are God of gods, King of kings, and Ruler over all rulers and nations. Your ways are above our ways. Yet, You are personal Redeemer and Friend.

We confess our human limitations as we confront the great issues of life. We plead for divine help.

Bless all Your servants in government everywhere; especially, those assembled here in this House. May they receive wisdom and strength beyond their normal abilities that by and from their actions truth will be honored, justice will be done, and peace established among us.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REV. W. JEAN RICHARDSON

(Mr. JONES of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to introduce to my colleagues the Reverend W. Jean Richardson, moderator of the general assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, who gave today's opening prayer. As the only Cumberland Presbyterian in this House, it is a great honor for me to have him as my guest today.

Dr. Richardson graduated from Bethel College located in my congressional district in 1951. He also attended and graduated from the Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary in 1955. He has devoted his life to the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, having served as pastor in a number of churches. In addition to his duties as moderator of the general assembly, he

also serves as pastor of the Beaver Creek Church in Knoxville, Tenn. He is in Washington to attend a conference of participating Presbyterian denominations this week.

It is a great honor for me and for this Chamber to have the leader of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church with us today. Dr. Richardson has provided great leadership not only to this church but his community as well and is an outstanding example of how one makes his Christian commitment the central theme of his everyday life. Dr. Richardson, I am grateful for your being with us today.

DISCHARGE PETITION FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 149, BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening, President Reagan gave his first state of the Union address. It was a well delivered address, but I think he has missed the point.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economy is in desperate straits. Unemployment is nearing 10 percent and interest rates remain at restrictively high levels.

Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the President that it is time to get this country going again. However, I strongly disagree with his methods. He is obviously not going to give up the ghost of supply-side economics, so recovery will be long and painful.

Mr. Speaker, the economy will not improve until we lower interest rates and that will not occur until we reduce the huge budget deficits and balance the Federal budget. For these reasons, today I am filing a discharge petition on House Joint Resolution 149, the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to bring this all-important legislation to the floor for consideration.

WE NEED ACTION NOW

(Mr. HARKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, as Ronald Reagan was giving the Warner Brothers version of "There is a light at the end of the tunnel," out in the grassroots of Iowa, the voters were rewriting the script.

Yesterday there was a special election held for a legislative seat for the Iowa House, District 84, in Burlington, Iowa. That seat had been held by a Republican who vacated it to move to California to find work. Burlington has an estimated unemployment rate of over 12 percent.

Yesterday the Democratic candidate, Elaine Baxter, swept that seat with 61 percent of the vote. That was the fourth straight Democratic victory in Iowa since November—three of which seats were previously held by Republicans.

The voters of Burlington said something yesterday which is going to be repeated throughout the Midwest this fall—that a movie script version of real life is fine for the theater, but is disastrous for our farmers and workers of this country.

Farm prices, in real terms, are at their worst level since the depression. Layoffs and plant closings are occurring all over Iowa. Our economy is in real trouble. We need action now, not theatrics.

PLANNING TO COVER YOUR OWN BURIAL COSTS SHOULD NOT BLOCK SSI OR MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I just cannot believe the way Government programs operate. A whole range of States have programs designed to cover burial costs of individuals who have been on public assistance, but under the Federal medicaid and SSI programs, owning a burial plot or burial insurance program counts against you. In short, that means those programs encourage people to dispose of assets they have put into covering the costs of their own burial. In this way, we are discouraging people from taking care of themselves.

That does not make good sense, and it adds to the impression that the Federal Government is insensitive and uncaring. I hope we will straighten this out. To do so, I have introduced legislation today that would add to the list of assets to be excluded from the resources test for medicaid and SSI eligibility, burial plots, and burial insurance programs. I would welcome the cosponsorship of each and every Member of the House.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

WE STILL HAVE THINGS TO LEARN FROM ROOSEVELT

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as this week we commemorate the 100th birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the anniversary of the beginning of the New Deal for the American people, we will find in our observations that we can still learn things from Roosevelt and from the New Deal.

We can learn of both his accomplishments and his faults and I am sure we are going to hear a great deal about his faults.

Perhaps Roosevelt was best when talking about his own faults. I particularly like it when he said:

Better the occasional sins of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

WE MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. LEVITAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, last night, listening to the state of the Union speech I search my memory trying to remember back to the days when a balanced budget was important. I remember when we were told, and many of us believed, that high deficits would bring this Nation to economic ruin, would bring about greater inflation, would add more to the interest rate increases, but I did not hear any remedies proposed last night. In fact, I realized there was an ominous silence about the importance of a balanced budget, when we could expect one, and how it would be achieved.

What I did hear is that we are going to continue to have a \$100 billion deficit this year. Those income tax reductions, Mr. Speaker, which were voted by Congress last year, to provide savings and investment to create more productivity will not be going into the private sector where they could accomplish that purpose, but they will have to be used to finance the \$100 billion Federal deficit. I suggest that drain will not only destroy the economic recovery program, but will bring the American people, small businessmen and homebuilders, even higher interest rates and assured ruin.

We better get on with the problem of balancing the budget and bringing down these high deficits. That should be among our highest priorities and not forgotten, as the state of Union speech seemed to do last night.

DEFICITS MUST BE REDUCED

(Mr. PEYSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the President should have listened to Abraham Lincoln's advice when Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

The President never last night addressed the issues that really has the people of this country worried—the issues of unemployment, high interest rates, and the ballooning deficit.

Instead he talked about 1984, and giving the food stamp program back to the States, giving welfare back to the States. Can you imagine 50 food stamp plans, 50 welfare plans? It will not be the United States, it will be the dis-united States.

I hope this Congress, as I said the other day, will have the guts to turn these programs down and get us on the track of reducing deficits and protecting the people.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today a bill for an urgent supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$210,490,000 for grants to States for unemployment insurance and employment services. Mr. NATCHER has authorized me to say that he joins with me on this bill. The purpose of the bill is to provide the funds that were stricken out by the Conte substitute continuing resolution which was passed in the waning days of the last session. As a result of that cut added to previous Reagan cuts, the employment services in almost every State of the union are a shambles—this at a time when almost 9 million people are unemployed. Such cuts at this time are ridiculous.

Let me tell you what is happening in my own State of Illinois.

First, Statewide layoffs and closings will begin on February 15 with the least senior employees being terminated.

Second, 22 Job Service offices and 11 WIN offices will be closed. After these closings, the State will have only 38 Job Service offices and 7 WIN offices.

Third, a total of 800 employees will lose their jobs. Of that amount, 500 will be employees who now work in Job Service offices and in the central and regional offices of that organization. The remaining 300 employees who will lose their jobs now work in the WIN office.

After the reductions, 475 employees will be left with the Job Service, a 49-

percent reduction and 120 employees will be left with WIN, a 72-percent reduction. This is the office which attempts to secure full- and part-time jobs for AFDC welfare recipients.

When the bill was on the floor last December 10, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, said:

Let me assure you we have carefully constructed this legislation to assure that first of all no state unemployment office may be closed as a result of this legislation. Second, no employees of these offices may be laid off as a result of this legislation. If his calculations are wrong, the administration will submit a supplemental budget refund to assure processing the higher workload.

Well, I say the administration's guesses are wrong and that we need action now to stop the massive layoffs in Employment Service offices. It is sheer stupidity to cut off and to stifle one of the few instruments we have to put people back to work.

This bill makes available an additional \$210,490,000 from the unemployment trust fund to restore the Employment Service staffing level to the level of the March 1981 budget.

This will provide for a staff level of 24,800 nationwide. The present continuing resolution provides only 17,500 staff positions with an appropriation of \$1,932,656,000. The funds appropriated here will provide a total of \$2,143,146,000 in fiscal year 1982 for this account.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action on my bill.

□ 1515

THE NEW FEDERALISM

(Mr. COLLINS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States made a stirring and inspiring address on where we should go in 1982. There were two features of it that particularly impressed me. The first was this federalism approach, which means that in the future we can delegate better to the local areas so many of these functions the Federal Government now controls.

What it will mean is that we will be able to cut waste. We will be able to cut fraud. We will be able to cut duplication.

The other strong point was he said there will be no tax increases. Now, we have got to absolutely stop taxing. We need more savings, and he said we will have more incentive to save.

Remember that in this country today we are only able to save 5 percent. In Japan they are saving 18 percent.

In order to create jobs, we need more savings in America.

TWO OUTLOOKS ON AMERICA

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, last night we heard two different kinds of outlooks on America. We heard President Reagan inspire us with a message of progress and hope. And we heard the Democratic reply of doom and despair, that offered criticism, but nothing in the way of programs or alternatives.

But the Democrats' message told us a lot about their party and its concern about taxpayers. The centerpiece of their flashy production was a report on a series of trips around the country by the Ways and Means Committee. You may remember that there were complaints about those road shows here on the House floor some weeks ago and we were assured that they were assured that they were serving a serious legislative purpose and they were not politically motivated.

Now we find out differently. The Democrats admitted to spending \$65,000 for their partisan message last evening. What they did not say is that tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars were used to help produce that show. Tens of thousands of dollars were used that might better be directed toward reducing the Federal deficits that the Democrats profess to be so concerned about.

The fact is the Democrats today are no different from the Democrats who failed the country yesterday. They still believe in tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect, they hope, elect. They showed us so last night.

I KNOW THE QUESTION BUT
WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post today carried a story about the Democratic Party's filmed documentary on the state of the Union.

Now, after reporting the substance of that doom-and-gloom, snake-oil show biz, the Post stated—now, this is the Washington Post I say to my friends—this:

While the film offered no specific alternatives, the Senate Democratic minority explored some "new ideas" with a familiar ring, some straight out of the New Deal—

That is according to the Washington Post.

Now, those ideas are 50 years old. There we have it, Mr. Speaker. The Democratic Party wants to go way back. It has no alternatives to the President's program, and its newest ideas are very old—50, 60, 75 years old. I do not know whether it has any of

the former President's taped messages, but we will look forward to see if it does.

For years the Democrats have relied on political machines. These days they seem to rely on a time machine for journeys way back.

A DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN AD

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I think that last night's television response by the Democrats to the President's state of the Union address was unfortunate.

It obviously was prepared by a slick advertising agency from Madison Avenue. That part is OK; but they put it together without even giving the President the courtesy of listening to his speech and then reacting to his proposals.

The most pathetic part of the response prepared in advance was that there was not one positive alternative mentioned. It was strictly a campaign ad, at a time when America wants ideas and leadership.

It is obvious that we got ideas and leadership from the podium last night, not from the assortment of one liners that came in the name of a response.

THE TAXPAYER PAID
DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE

(Mr. HILER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, following the state of the Union address in this Chamber last night, at least two of the major television networks aired a Democrat response to the President's message. It obviously was produced in advance of the President's speech at quite an expense, with a great deal of planning.

While the air time for this politically motivated response was provided without charge by the networks, its production, according to each network commentator, was paid for and provided by the Democratic Party.

I had the opportunity to watch this elaborate presentation on TV last night, and noted the extensive use of field hearings by the Ways and Means Committee on the supposed effects of Reaganomics. These hearings, which are supposed to be official functions of the committee and of this body, have been taxpayer funded. This includes air travel, lodging and meal expenses, and all expenses associated with the conduct of those hearings.

I wonder if the taxpayers who saw this show appreciated the use of these publicly funded hearings in a politically funded, politically produced, and

politically motivated campaign presentation?

THE SENIOR AIDES PROGRAM
SHOULD BE CONTINUED

(Mrs. HECKLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the President signed the Older Americans Act, which includes in its provisions the program for the senior aides. There is some talk about the survival of the program and I just would simply like to bring to my colleagues' attention the fact that the senior aides program which allows 127 communities in this Nation to benefit from the lifetime experiences of more than 10,000 of our senior citizens should be continued. These aides work in a variety of functions. They generally spend about 20 hours a week providing support for the local council on aging, for social service and Outreach programs, to the American Red Cross. They give of their knowledge and their experience while providing a very dependable source of manpower for the local communities.

These are individuals who have given a great deal to their country and have the ability to continue to serve. It is serving the American interests, helping local communities use local personal resources to solve local problems.

I support the senior aide program very strongly, as I do all programs for the elderly, and hope it can be continued.

THE GREAT SAN FRANCISCO
49ERS

(Mr. JOHN L. BURTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to take this minute to pay tribute to the No. 1 team in the country, the San Francisco 49ers, coach Bill Walsh, Joe Montana, Eddie DeBartolo, Jr., the owner, and the people of San Francisco who have waited a long, long, long time and we are No. 1. We will continue to be No. 1 for about 10 years.

THE NEW FEDERALISM
HIGHWAY

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last evening the President spoke about the new federalism and I just would like to touch for a moment on one small aspect of that.

Apparently the President indicates that we should take 2 of the 4 cents that presently goes into the Federal highway trust fund, turn that 2 cents back to the States, along with the total responsibility by the States for everything in highways other than the interstate program.

Well, the facts are from the Department of Transportation itself, Mr. Speaker, we cannot complete our responsibility to the interstate program through 1986 even with the total 4 cents that we have now, so we certainly cannot meet that responsibility with only 2 cents; so if we indicate that we are attempting to give it to the States, we could give them the responsibility for the 100,000 or more unsafe bridges that are not on the Interstate System, the primary system, the secondary system, the highway safety program, and as I understand it, the total mass transit program; if we gave them that total responsibility and did not give them any money back from the Federal Highway System, we still would not be able to complete our much-needed Interstate System if we keep the 4 cents; so that is basic arithmetic and that has to be considered during this session before we openly embrace some kind of a plan that is going to give us an awful lot in transportation for nothing, or for half price; so I think we have got to look into that. Those are the mathematical facts.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1982

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., January 25, 1982.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following Members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1982: the Honorable Gerry E. Studds of Massachusetts, the Honorable William J. Hughes of New Jersey, and the Honorable Don Young of Alaska.

As Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman.

□ 1530

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., January 26, 1982.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 453 of the 96th Congress, as amended, I have appointed the following Members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1982: the Honorable Mario Biaggi of New York, the Honorable Brian J. Donnelly of Massachusetts, and the Honorable Paul N. McCloskey of California.

As Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With warmest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman.

LET POLAND BE POLAND: A DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 382) to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I yield to the chairman of the committee for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 382, providing for the release within the United States of the International Communication Agency production "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland."

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me note that there are many people responsible for this resolution but chief among them is my good friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable Ed DERWINSKI. It has been my privilege to have served with Mr. DERWINSKI on the House Foreign Affairs Committee since he came to Congress almost 20 years ago. During those two decades and in a variety of ways, Ed DERWINSKI has shown a devoted and determined concern for the people of Poland. His contribution to this resolution and many other legislative initiatives over the years affirms and confirms his contribution and interest in promoting peace and stability in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, for their efforts and cooperation on this resolution.

Since the imposition of martial law in Poland some 7 weeks ago, concerned and freedom-loving people throughout the world have sought various means to express their support for the Polish people and the democratic renewal movement spearheaded by Solidarity. Both symbolic and material support has been evident through candles in the window, public demonstrations, and food and medical shipments. As a means of extending that support and of helping to keep alive the process of democratic renewal in Poland, President Reagan has proclaimed January 30 to be "Solidarity Day."

In keeping with that same spirit, the International Communication Agency (ICA) will broadcast worldwide on January 31, a television program which will seek to provide important moral support to the people of Poland. It is my understanding our beloved Speaker is going to participate in this program. It will include messages by several heads of Western governments, and by well-known personalities in the entertainment field. ICA intends to beam this production via satellite to over 300 million people throughout the world.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 382 is to waive limitations contained in section 501 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 on the dissemination of ICA materials in the United States. If Congress approves this legislation, the program will be broadcast in the United States on or around January 31, or within 30 days thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland need to know through every possible means that the American public and all freedom-loving people of the world

are deeply concerned about their fate and strongly support the efforts of the Polish people to solve problems in their own way. By increasing awareness in the United States of this important objective, House Joint Resolution 382 deserves the unequivocal support of the Congress. I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am pleased to join with the House leadership in sponsoring this resolution which would allow the International Communication Agency to make available in the United States the film entitled, "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity with the People of Poland." The film would be aired on or about January 31 in commemoration of Solidarity Day.

It is appropriate and politically symbolic that we permit this film to be shown within the United States. The courageous actions of the Polish people and of the independent trade union, Solidarity, are historic in nature. At this moment, Poles are risking their safety and well-being in order to secure an additional measure of freedom. So that this momentous event may be fully appreciated in all its complexity, the American people should have the benefit of this excellent documentary—"Let Poland Be Poland."

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution. By allowing this film to be shown in the United States, we are demonstrating our commitment to freedom worldwide.

We are also reinforcing our previous warning to the Soviet Union and their quislings in Warsaw that the United States cares what happens to the Polish people, and will not tolerate an erosion of the gains already won by Solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have the time, but he may yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) intend to object? He has a reservation of objection. Does the gentleman intend to object?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to, obviously not, as a cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my dear

friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, in this legislative effort.

The eyes of the world will be watching this program Sunday night. It should dramatically intensify the world's interest in the Communist oppression of Poland. Frankly, cooperation of free world nations with the United States in responding to the martial law imposed in Poland has been disappointing, and this dramatic film should serve to underscore the oppressiveness of the situation directed from the U.S.S.R.

The people of the United States have been inspired by the resistance of the Polish people to communism. We have seen their pride in Pope John Paul II, their support of the amazing development of the Solidarity movement, which has gained the support of the AFL-CIO for its tremendous effort to honestly represent the workers of Poland. Solidarity also is a legitimate nationalistic movement.

The martial law imposed by the Communist regime in Poland is only the latest episode in the tragedy afflicting the Polish people and all the peoples of Eastern Europe as a result of the Yalta agreement under which the Soviets have suppressed the freedoms for which they yearn.

I am especially pleased that our Speaker is among the distinguished persons who will be appearing in this film. I urge all Members to support this resolution waiving the prohibition against showing this film in the United States. The film is in the public interest and in the interest of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would not be any opposition to this resolution, but when the Members realize that our beloved Speaker is one of the participants in the film, that would certainly answer any questions anyone might have as to the validity of the resolution.

I am very pleased to support the argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI). I would like to point out that what we are dealing with is a battle worldwide for the attention and, therefore, the minds of men. Even given this media world we live in these days, after 7 weeks now of martial law, the story in Poland is starting to fade away from the headlines, but the oppression by the Polish Army continues.

It is important that this dramatic program, which will have a worldwide impact, have the full support of the Congress. The other body is going to give it its full support. It is totally bipartisan. It is going to be one of the finest American efforts to dramatize the evils of communism that we have seen in many years. I think it serves a tremendous purpose in that it will dramatize the fight the Polish people are waging for freedom, and just as important, it will also dramatize the

fact that communism is inherently weak, evil, and doomed to failure. That is a lesson that has to be learned again and again in many parts of the world where people sometimes even get tolerant of the Communist foreign policies and Communist machinations. I think this is a very practical program. This resolution deserves everyone's full support. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin, our distinguished chairman, and the gentleman from Michigan, our ranking member, and the gentleman from Illinois, for bringing this measure to the floor at this appropriate time.

I urge my colleagues to fully support this endeavor of allowing our International Communications Agency to show the film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland," at a time when our entire Nation is going to commemorate January 30 as a day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

The people of Poland cherish the right of freedom. It is extremely important that we demonstrate our support of those people who are fighting for this priceless right, a right that we enjoy every day, and one that they are being denied.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The people of Poland are the victims of repression, not the cause of it. Why, then, are they being punished for it?

While I consider this resolution a salutary one, the tragic fact is that the Poles are not merely hungry; they are starving. Our Government's cancellation of food aid to Poland has contributed to the suffering of the Polish people. Private organizations are doing their best to provide enough food to see them through the winter, but it is scarcely enough to provide the barest essential for the very young and the very old. Meanwhile, the poultry industry in Poland, its most important source of animal protein, is in danger of collapse because of the lack of grain feed.

I totally agree with the administration's efforts to encourage the Polish Government to lift martial law, to free those in arbitrary detention, and to restore the internationally recognized rights of the Polish people to free

speech and association, but we are only adding to the suffering of the Polish people by penalizing their government through cutoff of aid. I urge the administration to find more appropriate means to let the Polish Government know that we will not tolerate repression, and to restore food shipments to its helpless citizens.

Like the prisoners of Fascist and Communist States to whom the political persuasion of the jailer does not make much difference, so also to those who are starving the refusal to offer lifesaving nourishment is a mortal wound, irrespective of the high principles behind the refusal.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to ask for regular order.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman further reserving the right to object? He does not have control of the time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to go on record as supporting this joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, when the U.S. Information Agency—now called the International Communication Agency—was founded, Congress mandated that its media products, such as films, should not be distributed in the United States.

There was a good reason for this prohibition. No one wants to see a tax-supported information agency engaging in programs in this country.

There is a danger these programs could turn into partisan political propaganda. Even if such programs were merely perceived as propaganda by large numbers of Americans, it would not be right.

So the Congress, in its wisdom, put in this prohibition. I think it makes good sense. This is not to say, however, that the prohibition was meant to be absolute, as numerous subsequent actions by the Congress have indicated.

There have been instances in which the Congress granted the information agency a "waiver" so its films could be seen by the people who pay for it, the American taxpayers.

I suppose the most memorable of these exceptions to the rule was the film on the death of President John F. Kennedy, titled, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." This moving tribute to the slain President was shown on television, as well as in American theaters.

I am informed over 70 International Communication Agency films have been allowed to be shown in the United States by Congress.

So, there is ample precedent to show ICA material to the American people.

I believe the current ICA presentation entitled "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland" is obviously one of those films the American people should get the chance to see. That is why I have joined our colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution that will allow it to be shown in the United States on or about January 31, 1982, and for 30 days thereafter.

It promises to be a moving tribute to the spirit of freedom so typical of our country, as well as of the people of Poland. It is nonpartisan and in the great tradition of American concern for human rights.

I would personally like to see more ICA material made available to the taxpayers, while still keeping the spirit of the prohibition against wholesale dissemination of their products.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ECKART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 382

Whereas the Polish Action Committee has called on free peoples everywhere to commemorate January 30, 1982, as a Day of Solidarity with the People of Poland;

Whereas the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), and other labor organizations throughout the world are commemorating this day with rallies and other observances;

Whereas the President has issued a proclamation declaring January 30, 1982, to be Solidarity Day in the United States;

Whereas the heads of state of many free world nations will join in observing Solidarity Day;

Whereas these observances will be broadcast worldwide, over television and radio, to an expected audience of over 300 million people; and

Whereas it is desirable that the people of the United States be aware of, and participants in, this worldwide effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the second sentence of section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461), the Director of the International Communication Agency may make the film entitled "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland" available for broadcasting in the United States on January 31, 1982, or within thirty days thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of this resolution.

Many times in the past, the Congress has asked that a film produced by the International Communication Agency for overseas viewing be released for distribution within the United States. We have asked for such exceptions in the law because we have felt the films to be of exceptional value in helping Americans to learn more about our own past and present, about the position of the United States in the world community, and about the policies and cultures of other nations.

House Joint Resolution 382 is not an unusual resolution. In fact it is in keeping with ICA's mandate which recognizes America's need to understand the aspirations of the people of other nations as well as the need to represent to overseas audiences the policies and varied cultures present in the United States.

This ICA film reflects U.S. concern for the plight of the Polish people. Its release would allow Americans to view a documentary which points out the trying events in Poland from a wide perspective. The film includes statements from many world leaders in addition to a statement from our own President. It presents the history of Solidarity and covers demonstrations of support from around the world for the Polish labor union. But most importantly, the release of this film would allow Americans, in a small way, to join with many other nations in celebrating the message of Solidarity and in mourning the suppression of that message in Poland.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. As a member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Telecommunications, and after consultations with my chairman, Representative TIM WIRTH, I wish to engage the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations (Mr. FASCELL) in a colloquy on the dissemination of this program to the American people by the Public Broadcasting Service.

The program to be shown, "Let Poland Be Poland," may be transmitted on the facilities of the Public Broadcasting Service for use by its member stations. I wish to stress that PBS would not be broadcasting this event as a PBS program. It is a production of the International Communication Agency. It would be distributed under a provision of the Public

Broadcasting Act (section 396 (h)(2)) which permits excess satellite distribution capacity to be made available to other entities on a nondiscriminatory basis. This provision of law was not designed or intended to provide a means to transmit Government messages, but as a way to provide access to public broadcasting stations by independent producers. The circumstances of this particular broadcast via PBS, in other words, are unusual and exceptional.

An important issue is at stake here and should be understood by all concerned. Neither PBS, National Public Radio, nor any public broadcasting licensee should be viewed as having responsibilities or obligations that are different from commercial broadcasters in choosing to carry any programs—whether or not they are produced by the Government.

Under the Communications Act of 1934, television and radio stations reserve the right to exercise their independent broadcast judgment as to whether to carry news specials or other events. The choice is theirs—and not the Government's. This is a fundamental principle which the Government must respect at all times.

And it is of critical importance to public broadcasters, especially since they receive some Federal funding. But such funding is not and has never been provided in order to establish a Government-controlled medium carrying Government-produced messages. Indeed, the financing of public broadcasting has been structured precisely to insulate the system from political interference. Federal support for public broadcasting is intended to strengthen the very independence of editorial judgment that is so crucial to all broadcasters.

Nothing in the waiver we are considering today should be construed to compromise this basic tenet of communication law and practice.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully with the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Washington. This resolution is in no way intended to compromise the independence of public broadcasting. I agree that public broadcasters, no less than commercial broadcasters, must retain final judgment as to whether to broadcast any event, without interference by the Government. The sole intention in passing this resolution is to make this film available to interested Americans, as we have done with other ICA productions in the past.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he requires to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) for his work on

this legislation, and I thank him for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 382 and urge its overwhelming approval by my colleagues.

For more than 6 weeks the brave people of Poland have suffered oppression at the hands of their government. The spark of freedom which had been enkindled by the shipyard workers in Gdansk and which had spread throughout the country, had become too great a threat to Poland's Communist rulers. Martial law, internment and violence have replaced the traces of liberty which Solidarity had so painstakingly won.

It is important that individuals and nations that are offended by the military crackdown in Poland make those feelings known to the people of the world. One of the best ways of doing so is by insuring that the truth about the situation in Poland is widely broadcast. Congress has an opportunity to facilitate this effort by exempting the International Communication Agency's (ICA) film "Let Poland Be Poland" from the prohibition against domestic showing of the agency's films. Lifting the prohibition for this film will allow it to be shown in the United States during the upcoming worldwide day of solidarity with the people of Poland. It is a film which Americans should see and I hope that this Congress will take the steps necessary to insure that it will be shown.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my good friend and colleague, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in support of House Joint Resolution 382, the bill I cosponsored with him to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the film produced by the International Communication Agency entitled, "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland."

The Polish Action Committee has called on free peoples everywhere to join in the commemoration of January 30, 1982, as a Day of Solidarity with the people of Poland in their struggle against Communist repression, and the President has issued a proclamation declaring January 30 as Solidarity Day in the United States.

Many Poles have lost their lives, thousands have been prisoned, and basic freedoms of communication and movement have been severely curtailed or are nonexistent. We as Americans, along with free peoples all over the world, must join our hearts and our minds with the courageous Polish people, who have never lost their fervent desire for freedom. The shipyard workers, the coal miners, the farmers, and all the people of Poland must know that Americans will never be silent about this brutal war on their liberty.

The Communists in Moscow have worked to defeat the progress toward reform, even though both Communist Poland and the Kremlin have signed the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki agreement with the United States and its allies, advocating the freer movement of peoples, access to information, and humanitarian cooperation among peoples. Both nations are members of the United Nations and claim to believe in fundamental human rights, and in the dignity and worth of the individual.

On December 15, 1981, the Congress approved a resolution in support of the Solidarity Movement in Poland and its attempt to bring human dignity to Poland. The bill, which was adopted unanimously, places the responsibility for the present reign of terror in Poland on the Soviet Union.

The Congress also unanimously passed a resolution urging the President to halt the deportation of Poles in this country because of the grim situation in their homeland, and the administration has approved this recommendation.

The former Polish Ambassador to the United States has urged Americans not to be silent about the brutal war against freedom in Poland, and to give solidarity, support and humanitarian aid to the people of Poland.

On Solidarity Day, January 30, we join in our hearts and our minds with the brave people of Poland in their prayers for a just and peaceful end to their beloved country's difficulties.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 382 to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film, "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity with the People of Poland." The suppression of freedom in Poland by the Communist rulers and the courage displayed by the Polish people serve to remind the Americans of the need to cherish our own freedoms and human rights. The film, normally intended for the millions who are unfortunately trapped in the captive nations of Eastern Europe, will be a vivid reminder to the American audience that the Polish people need our sympathy and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 382 should also send a signal to the Communist rulers of Poland and Russia that we do not condone or tolerate their dictatorial actions.●

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at this point I will ask the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee if he has any requests for time under the regular order for the consideration and debating of this joint resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYED

(Mr. ECKART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I listened intently last night, as we all did, to President Reagan as he outlined the state of the Union. But nowhere in his remarks did I find any reference to the condition of 10 million and more unemployed people in our country. The silence, I will tell you, was deafening.

Let me offer to you another view, a Republican view, of the Reagan program. I am entering into the RECORD the recent statements of Howard Collier, director of the Office of Management and Budget for the State of Ohio—who said, in part, that Ohio is suffering “cardiac failure” and that the Reagan program was a “disaster” for Ohio.

With record unemployment in Ohio; with a record State deficit in Ohio, with a record tax increase in Ohio, our Republican Governor, James Rhodes, has seen fit to call a spade a spade in his administration’s candid assessment of the Reagan recession on Ohio.

I urge my colleagues from States who face economic difficulties to heed the warnings recently sounded in Ohio.

If left unabated—result in the destruction of much of State government and our system of public education at all levels.

The President is going for broke. And that is where we all will end up, if he does not succeed.

At this point I insert the following:

REMARKS OF HOWARD L. COLLIER, DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, STATE OF OHIO, JANUARY 19, 1982

TO THE STATE CONTROLLING BOARD

Thank you for allowing the OBM staff to make an extraordinary series of presentations here today. They are essential for clar-

ity but, at best, will only give a view of the economic and social depression that has a firm grip on Ohio.

I will provide an introduction and some remarks I feel pertinent for today and the coming weeks.

I appear before you today with moral and professional resolve to uphold the Constitution. There is no choice. My oath and yours is exact.

But I also appear before you with a deepening personal sadness, grief, and despair. At best, the required acts I will take to uphold my constitutional responsibility and yours will—if left unabated—result in the destruction of much of State government and our system of public education at all levels.

Collectively, the members of this board and I have spent more than 100 man years—nearly always working cooperatively—in designing, drafting and implementing the spectrum of programs and safety nets that are now in unprecedented jeopardy.

The newest game to sweep the State—including the State house and media—is what kind of something is to blame for our current state of affairs. The popularity of Rubik’s cube pales by comparison.

As a preface, I can say the speaker of the house, the President of the senate, the Governor, and members of both parties in both houses are virtually blameless.

The something is real.

Federal policies are destroying the industrial/agricultural heartland. Ohio is the heart of the heartland and is suffering cardiac failure.

A. Our steel industry has been given away by Federal policy, not by greedy management or corrupt unions. Dumping is transhipped, condoned or ignored or rationalized.

B. Grain embargoes—real and threatened—have made us an unreliable supplier for foreign markets.

C. Foreign auto imports are a glut while American manufacturers face restrictive tariffs in their attempts at the export market.

D. Federal interest policies have created a shambles of the construction and housing industries.

E. Federal tax/spending policies have created a trillion-dollar debt—growing daily—that must be constantly refinanced at higher cost, holding interest rates high.

F. The Federal Government has failed to adopt any concept of creative capitalism to provide the risk capital for the reindustrialization of the heartland.

G. The Federal Government’s policies caused the Ohio depression and collapse of basic industry, but the Federal Government expects remaining Ohio business to be taxed to repay our massive unemployment compensation Federal loan. This course of action will only make Ohio products more costly, close more businesses and make the problem more severe.

H. Federal policy is closing B.E.S. offices at a time when hope in Ohio is in short supply.

I. Social benefits (food stamps, medicaid) are being cut at the time of our greatest need.

J. Ohio—even while in a deepening depression—receives the fourth lowest rate of return on its tax dollars sent to Washington (Texas, Connecticut, Indiana).

K. Because of this litany, the general assembly is forced to raise taxes on a base that is either flat or constricting.

These are a lot of “somethings” that placed us where we are today. The com-

bined impact is only now becoming apparent.

Without a swift and massive shift in Federal policy toward Ohio, we can expect a worsening depression and a lengthy recession broken by episodic periods of growth. Those periods will provide hope but no long-term substance.

I could spend an hour explaining why the “sun belt” is not the reason for our current state of affairs. Our assets and location have improved since Ohio was first industrialized. It is important to understand but not critical to the presentation today.

Suffice it to say that the glass industry, the rubber industry, the steel industry, and the auto industry, will never again—in our lifetimes—provide jobs for Ohioans to the degree they did ten years ago, or five years ago.

Each of you has a feel for each one of these “somethings” that caused this meeting today. Your list might be longer than mine but would start with mine.

A specific indication for your concern was a little publicized appropriation you made to OMB in fiscal year 1983 to create an econometric model correlated to Ohio and the Ohio economy. Your intention was to quantify the difference between national models and the deflator effect of Ohio reality.

I am asking you for early funding so work can begin. It can be perfected for use by the next Governor and the next general assembly.

Done properly, it will save me from having to serve a fourth term under circumstances similar to today.

The technical presentation will be handled by Matt Filipic, assistant director, and our staff.

We are opposed to cutting welfare benefits. A cut at this time could precipitate the final collapse of the social safety net and clearly endanger life, health and safety.

Federal policies are already making holes in the net that Ohioans cannot afford to mend. Neither can we afford the risk of collapsing the net.

I don’t expect any of you to applaud this decision, but I ask your support that the check of last resort is not diminished due to insufficient funds.

This question will be on a future special board agenda.

There are probably members in the four caucuses who will not agree with the exemption of welfare benefits from cuts, but it is a responsible and humane act.

We have attempted to expose all known problems at this single meeting. That is only to free us all to address solutions in an orderly manner.

I will be working through George Lord seeking your advice on such matters as definition of emergencies, procedures to accelerate the capital program—including the prison bill, to create jobs, and lastly, keeping you informed on an orderly basis of what OMB is doing through this crisis.

We have spent all of my first 19 days in office defining the potential problem, that chase is still incomplete.

Hopefully, we can start next week on solutions.

Thank you for your time, courtesy and patience.

A TRIBUTE TO 1ST LT. MICHAEL A. MATTSON

(Mr. DYSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a history rich in the tradition of heroes. Today, I rise to honor and commemorate a young man who demonstrated his valor in a quiet manner. Air Force 1st Lt. Michael A. Mattson, flying a night intercept training mission, was lost at sea on December 18, 1981.

It is wrong to think that bravery can only be exhibited under combat conditions, one must also include those individuals who go out day after day in the defense of their country where the risk of fatal injury is always present. Every military pilot knows that each flight, whether in peace or war, possesses an element of danger. Yet, they remain aware that a strong and highly trained Air Force is a vital ingredient to this country's survival. First Lieutenant Mattson knew and appreciated the freedoms which we enjoy in the United States. His service and dedication to our Air Force was evidence that he was willing to protect these rights.

Michael Mattson was born on January 8, 1957, in Joppa, Md. Since his childhood he dreamed of becoming a pilot. He spent 4 hard years studying at the U.S. Air Force Academy, and then went on for 1 year of pilot training at Lubbock, Tex. This was followed by 3 months of fighter lead-in training at Hollman Air Force Base in New Mexico and then he was introduced to the Phantom jet during 6 months of intensive training at Luke Air Force Base, Ariz. Finally, on June 24, 1981, he was assigned as an aircraft commander to the 336th Tactical Fighter Squadron, 4th Tactical Fighter Wing, at Goldsboro, N.C.

First Lieutenant Mattson combined a love for flying with his love for his country. Perhaps his dream of becoming a pilot can best be expressed through his favorite poem.

HIGH FLIGHT

Oh, I have slipped the surly bonds of earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of sun split clouds-and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of-wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sunlit silence. Hovering there,
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through footless hills of air
Up, up the long delirious, burning blue
I've topped the windswept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or even eagle flew.
And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,

Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

—JOHN GILLESPIE MAGEE, Jr.

Michael was on his way to compiling an outstanding career record. I had the highest respect for his character and motivation. He was of the material of which heroes are made, and as is the case with such men, his stay among us was far too brief. I, along with his comrades and the Nation share the tremendous sorrow and extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family: We are all the poorer for his loss. Although he may no longer be with us, a little of his spirit and courage will remain in everyone his life touched. His untiring devotion to duty did much to increase the strength of the United States and promote the cause of justice and order throughout the world. His zestful energy and undaunted determination to serve his Nation will be an enduring example to all brave men and women who will follow in his profession.

CBS REPORT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BAILEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, something is dreadfully or terribly wrong at CBS. I had occasion last weekend to view the so-called CBS report on Southeast Asia. I guess it was in effect an attempt to try to dismiss out of hand the contention that General Westmoreland and others have made that the reason for that terrible policy failure had to do with something that happened here at home. It was an apparent thinly veiled attack or criticism of Westmoreland's remarks to that effect.

When I returned from overseas I had attended law school at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh at night, and as part of my studies I chose a seminar in political and civil rights. I wrote my thesis on press responsibility. The vast majority of the journalists in our country, I think, do try to adhere to some standard of responsibility and some degree of objectivity in the work that they do. As part of my studies, I had occasion to analyze a CBS white paper, "The Selling of the Pentagon." It was a very poor job, a very dishonest editing job that was done.

The reasons for the criticism were good. The questions that were raised were good. They were questions that should have been asked. The editing that was done, the way the material was treated, detracted from the credibility of that work. They also mocked the intent and the purpose of the first amendment and what it is for.

I have seen other CBS documentaries, "The Guns of Autumn." Walter Cronkite's response to "The Guns of

Autumn" when CBS was threatened with a lawsuit over its content was that, "Mirrors don't lie." That is rather naive. It is also a little self-righteous, and I do not think it is a fair way to use the 6:30 news.

I do not know what happened with the so-called juggling of figures in Southeast Asia. I honestly do not know. I would be dishonest if I said to you that I would be very quick to accept the CBS interpretation of events or their so-called investigative work done on that project. I do not have that kind of confidence in CBS's ability to be objective. But, I really have to wonder whether or not the outcome, what the policy affected, would have been any different. Let us suppose that those figures were juggled. I do not think it would make that much difference. I do not think that in terms of the political or military alternatives available to this country at the time, we would have done anything differently.

Second, I think the show does a greater disservice. It does something to truth and thus history, and I guess this is what turns in my stomach when I watch the great power of a large network, and I have no ax to grind with them, for what seems like almost personal reasons, distort the facts through imbalanced presentation.

I have no particular complaint against the media but I do when I, as a consumer of news, am fed information by CBS that is so distorted or so biased that it offends the sense of truth that I think all of us respect and admire.

We are left with a number of innuendos when the show is over. All right, you have aspersions cast on the character of American military leaders. Well, questions like that should be raised, and those kinds of things should be investigated, but the major innuendo was that somehow Tet was a great military defeat. Well, it was, but it was not much of a military defeat for us, and even the most casual observers of the war, even the most amateur historians, will admit that from a military point of view—and we have interpretations, we have cables that were intercepted from North Vietnam that indicate that they themselves have viewed it as a disastrous military defeat for them.

But, it was a tremendous propaganda victory, and it really leaves open the question that the CBS documentary would leave with all of you in your minds because they do not have the courage to address it. They do not have the courage to say that this was a policy failure that was due to a lack of America's proper military prosecution of the war. Because they cannot support that hypothesis. However as Americans we have all got to admit, because this is the truth, we decided to

make a decision that we did not want to spend the money or the blood to prosecute the war. So be it.

Let us abide by the opinions that force and form our policy here, that is, majority opinion. I do. I do not want to blame it on someone who is not responsible. The failure of this country to successfully prosecute the war in Southeast Asia was a horrendous policy mistake once we were involved and committed. We did not see it through. Let us have the guts as a country to admit that we collectively did not see it through.

It is absurd to assume that this Nation's military and personal and political and economic and cultural resources, properly applied, could not have militarily succeeded in producing a different outcome in Southeast Asia. We were outlasted, folks. That was the truth. Do not blame it on a bunch of soldiers. Do not accept the CBS position that wants to walk away from the responsibility and role they played in reporting a war, and perhaps getting a little big for their britches, and forgetting what words "perspective" and "balance" mean, consequently wish to distort reflections upon it.

I have no personal ax to grind with the news media. I have been treated very well at home. I have been treated fairly. But I have watched the series "60 Minutes," and this documentary, and other documentaries and I am waiting for the day that ABC or NBC will run a full-page ad in the New York Times or the Washington Post—and please, if they could just do it objectively—and in that ad say, "Folks, we are going to take a look at the writing of a CBS White Paper."

Maybe that is also, I would very gently suggest to my countrymen, a small part of the story, and that it is not going to be forgotten and its effects will not be washed away. They will not be expunged by trying to hang a badge on someone else and saying "see, if you had said something different, this would have turned out a different way."

Tet was a horrible military defeat for the other side. It was not perceived that way here. That is a shame.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this very important point to the Members of the House. I also had the opportunity to watch the CBS series, and I was disappointed in the way that it was presented to the American public. In fact, the series turned me off when it said right off that America's defeat in Vietnam was not a military defeat.

I was over there eight different times during the war, and our flag was never dipped over there. When we left,

we left and turned the war over to the South Vietnamese. I thought they could do the job. I thought they had had enough training.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman confirm a number of things? I would very much appreciate his help by asking a few questions. The gentleman is the chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and of course also serves on the Armed Services Committee, where he is obviously very experienced. The United States of America made a decision to leave Southeast Asia. At the time we left, as I understand it, the territorial integrity of South Vietnam was intact. Am I wrong?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will bear with me, is it not also true that when we left it was a matter of about 2 years, I think, before that country fell? There were a number of pitched battles, such as at An Loc. Even so, the news media reported that with little sympathy to the South. The gentleman knows that. Are those not facts? I am just curious. We were not driven from the country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We were out of Vietnam with all of our fighting forces 2 years before South Vietnam fell. There is no question about it, it was a political war. If we wanted to unleash our forces, in my humble opinion, within 2 or 3 weeks we could have overrun North Vietnam; we could have totally destroyed all the cities of North Vietnam.

But, my other point is, I do not think the series treated General Westmoreland fairly at all. I think he was, overall, one of our great commanders that we had. It was a difficult war to fight, and certainly one can go back and pick up things that did not go exactly right in any type of conflict we have been involved in. Nothing goes right in a war, as the gentleman knows. There are always some problems. You just cannot hit the target on the first shot.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I would add to that—and I fought there—I would have to add that while I think those enemy forces were nice, tough people, I had a lot more respect for those soldiers, I still bear no malice for those soldiers on the other side, of whom I had many opportunities to see die, a lot more respect for them than I do for our armchair philosophers.

□ 1300

I have got to be honest with you about that. But in a country like ours it is important that we be honest with ourselves as to what constitutes a policy failure so we can learn from it and improve in the future. Perhaps we never should have been involved. There is a debate whether the war was

fought properly, but it should not be painted as something that it is not.

Anyone who thinks that any nation can carry on a war without the kind of political support to keep it going and to follow through with its objectives is being naive. Wars are not divided into military and political fronts. Wars are efforts. They are an ultimate form of human conflict. They are terribly bloody, they are horribly painful, they are terribly scarring, one war is all the terrible things that all wars are. But they are ultimate human endeavors that are not simply blamable on some mistake by a small group, of involved persons by a group of people who happen to enjoy a privileged access to the American people, and I think CBS is very much afraid of the hypocrisy that they have weaved in failing to address their own role that Westmoreland criticized.

I have talked to reporters who had their leads rewritten in Tokyo. I met a reporter in New York 2 weeks ago who spent 2½ years with one of the major networks who was very upset with the way his stories were handled.

I do not want to blame it on the news media. That is not fair also. The failure stemmed from a multitude of things, but I think that media distortion was part of it. As to William Westmoreland and the figures on Tet and the infiltration, it is just patently asinine to say that that's the reason for failure. To do so is to grossly exaggerate.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the problems that brought our commanders into this picture and why CBS did this, it seemed to me that there was some type of argument or hard feelings between the CIA and the DIA during the war. That is what came out to me in watching the CBS show.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to point this out, my interpretation, plainly and simply, with the way it was left and the way Mike Wallace left it, was that Westmoreland had made references to the war being lost here at home. Given the military job that was done and given the military objectives, I would have to say that I agree with that contention.

I think by and large, militarily, where we went, where we had to go and with the military goals we needed to achieve, we did achieve our objectives. I do not think there is any doubt about that. Tet would have happened 6 months later and Tet would have happened again if we had done the same things. But they did not and they could not, because they got their behinds whipped.

So let us not blame that on the soldiers and the commanders who went to do a job that they believed was right.

Essentially, the reason why I think CBS did that—and this innuendo was left at the end of the show—was because Westmoreland had had the incredible gall—can we imagine it—to suggest that perhaps there was a number of different factors involved, many of them political, here in the United States, including this Congress, that led to that political reversal, which it clearly was.

I mean we started out with an objective and we left in the middle of it. That is what we did. We did not get booted out. We walked away. Maybe we Americans do not like to admit that we walked away, but that is what we did. That is the truth. We cannot blame it on anybody. We cannot blame it on General Westmoreland, and I do not want to blame this on CBS. But CBS has a responsibility to be balanced, and I do not think they are.

I think General Westmoreland touched a nerve, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY). I think he touched a nerve, and I think it hurts. I think it pinches a little bit.

When you bring out a "sacred cow" like Walter Cronkite, who can predict what happens, but whom no one can and when you maintain that question one has to wonder about the reason for the show. I think they are getting too big for their britches. Naturally, it is not my role to interfere with them, but I hope the media in this country appreciates this because the Nation depends on objectivity and the freedom of the press. To abuse that freedom is to abuse us all and Government is not the only abuser.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of this body, not to argue about the way we prosecuted the war but in an effort to try to get away from what I see to be a continuing effort to somehow condemn those people who served as simple soldiers in that war as failures.

We have constantly seen them painted, in story after story on television, and in the print media, and so forth, in terms that they came back as terrible failures. They are painted as social failures, and now by the rewriting of history they want to make sure that everybody understands they were failures as soldiers.

As everybody knows, we lost the Tet offensive, but the gentleman stated correctly in fact that it was not a military defeat for the United States. We were successful. Unfortunately, that

was not the interpretation back here, and to the extent we can make sure the Vietnam war veteran does not suffer from these misstatements and misconceptions of the role he played, I think we have an obligation to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for adding to that effort a restoration of the facts and the reality of what occurred from what we have seen over the past few years.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

LEGISLATION TO AID IN RESOLVING WHOLESALE ELECTRIC RATE CASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, as was the case a year ago, there is a substantial backlog of wholesale electric rate increase applications pending at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and today, as I did on December 3, 1980, I am introducing legislation that I believe would help the Commission more promptly resolve wholesale electric rate cases.

Delays in taking final action on these applications often permits rates which may be unjustifiable to take effect. In some instances, a contested rate becomes effective while one or more other challenged rate increases have already been allowed to take effect; this "pancaking" can compound the degree to which rates electric consumers pay are different from what the Commission finally determines to be fair.

Commonwealth Edison has proposed an electric rate increase for cities which purchase power at wholesale in its service area in Illinois—Batavia, Geneva, St. Charles, Naperville, Rock Falls, and Rochelle. This could take effect before two previous applications for increases by ComEd and affecting these cities, now pending at the Commission, are resolved. Another increase is encompassed in a lawsuit now before the Court of Appeals—D.C. Circuit. Obviously, should delays in taking final action be reduced, electric consumers served by municipal wholesale purchasers of power would not find themselves in this unfortunate situation.

The proposed "Wholesale Electric Rate Fairness Act," which I am again introducing, comprises two statutory changes suggested by former Commission Chairman Charles B. Curtis in his January 1980 report, "Decisional Delay in Wholesale Electric Rate Increase Cases: Causes, Consequences and Possible Remedies," submitted to Congress pursuant to the Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act of 1978. One change would allow a decision on

whether to postpone the rate increase for up to 5 months to be made by one commissioner or a senior FERC official rather than by the full Commission. Under a second provision of the bill, those challenging rate increases could more quickly appeal decisions in the court system, bypassing a time-consuming rehearing of the case by the Commission. These changes would likely relieve the Commission of scores of agenda items each year, giving it more time to work on decisions of greater significance, including rulings on rate fairness. Further discussion of the provisions of this legislation, along with its text, can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 3, 1980, at page 32079.

Mr. Speaker, the wholesale electric rate case backlog has been growing. At the end of fiscal year 1979, there were 248 cases under part II of the Federal Power Act pending, most of which involve wholesale electric rates. There were 281 pending at the end of fiscal year 1980 and 312 when the 1981 fiscal year concluded. It is my hope that Congress will examine this circumstance and take action to reduce delays in resolving contested rate increase applications. The legislation I am introducing today is one means by which we can afford consumers a greater degree of fairness in the process of determining wholesale electric rates.●

COMMITTEE STAFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the courageous leadership of President Reagan, we are seeing a renewed spirit and hope in the country. Cuts were made in our oversized Federal budget. I believe, it is now time for sacrifice at home. How can we justify cuts in the bureaucracy while Congress is padding its own halls with overloaded committee staff at the expense of all American taxpayers?

Let me say that congressional statutory staff should remain the same as it is right now. Let us keep these 30 people which most House Committees are allowed, but let us reduce the additional investigative staff. These investigative staff are simply political appointees hired by the Chairman and not the committee's full membership. They are not employed under civil service, very few are allotted to the minority, and have no required or uniform qualifications. Let us look at the enormous growth of these staff during the last decade. This growth is a startling example of an inflated bureaucracy.

In 1973, congressional investigative staff numbered 570. In only 7 years,

this number zoomed up to 1,161. At this rate, by the year 2000, we would have approximately 9,000 people compared to the 570 just a few years ago. Imagine the cost to the taxpayer.

These staff salaries cost money. Their salaries are provided by annual funding resolutions passed by the House. These salary levels have grown tremendously. In 1971, the total committee budget which includes the investigative staff, was \$6,800,000. By 1980, this budget skyrocketed to \$43,602,118. Some of the committees with the most blatant growth are Energy and Commerce, with investigative funding of \$1,474,000 in the 92d Congress which rose to \$7,458,000 by the 96th; Merchant Marine which zoomed from \$519,000 in the 92d to \$3,176,245 in the 96th; and during the same period of time, the Agriculture Committee mushroomed from \$250,000 to \$2,272,000. The Rules Committee which only needed \$5,000 in the 92d Congress exploded to the astronomical figure of \$1,134,000 in the 96th.

This staffflation received the attention of many Members last year, including 52 new freshman Republicans. But, as support for reducing the committee funding resolutions was mounting, the leadership got scared of possible defeat. The Rules Committee passed what was later called the "gag rule". What this did was to combine all committee funding requests into one resolution in order to protect the committees, because most of their budgets could not stand up to close scrutiny. A careful review and debate of each committee's resolution individually by the House would have allowed many budgets to go down to defeat.

The House mandated this unfair approach of combining all budgets into one resolution. The resolution provided a 10 percent reduction in the 1981 authorizations level over 1980 authorizations. This sounds fine, but in reality, it was an increase in authorizations of 6 percent over the 1980 expenditures. It boils down to an illusionary savings—we are not spending less of the taxpayers' money as it would appear—we are spending more. Authorization is not the bottom line. The appropriation is not cut, and the spending goes on.

Last year we had tremendous support from the Committee on House Administration which voluntarily cut its 1981 budget by 20 percent from 1980 expenditures. This was a constructive step toward reducing the burden of the Federal Government on all citizens. As committee staffs grow, the amount of work increases without necessarily increasing the effectiveness or efficiency in order to justify new staff jobs. I hope that many other committees follow the example set by House Administration last year.

Soon the process begins again. The Nation is watching to see how we, the Congress, set the example for fiscal restraint and responsibility. We cannot better serve the President and his program than by cutting back our own oversized and expensive investigative committees.

We are all appreciative of the hard working and efficient House Administration Committee. The gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) chairs the committee. Mr. FRENZEL of Minnesota is the ranking member. The subcommittee handling the funding budgets is chaired by Mr. ANNUNZIO of Illinois with ranking member Mr. BADHAM of California. Remember, they cut their committee staff budget last year. Lets all join in more cuts.

□ 1615

OVERSIGHT HEARING SET ON COAL DEATHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, which I chair, will conduct oversight hearings into the series of tragedies that have killed at least 40 coal miners since the budget cuts went into effect for the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

The first hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 23, 1982, in room 2261 of the Rayburn Building.●

KING CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise again at the outset of the 2d session of the 97th Congress, as I have since the last Congress in the very beginning, with respect to the matter of what I call King Crime's continued reign unchallenged in our country, the murder or death of Federal Judge John W. Wood, and the prior attempts on the life of the assistant district attorney for the Federal western district. This is the then assistant whose life was almost taken in an outright attack on him prior to the death of Judge Wood.

In May it will be 3 years since Judge Wood was assassinated. Since then I have risen time after time in this forum after it was apparent that no progress was being made in the successful resolution of that case leading to the apprehension, arrest, and conviction of those culpable of these very dastardly crimes. I was impelled to do so because it was obvious I should since this happened in the environs—not within my district but in the environs of my district, what used to be the district at one time, the 20th Con-

gressional District which I happen to have the privilege of representing at this time and which included the entirety of Bexar County. Today it is the inner portion of the City of San Antonio. And these crimes were committed in one of the most sophisticated, affluent suburbs not only in Texas but anywhere in the country.

There was no question that both crimes, the attempt on the assistant Federal district attorney first, and then the successful attempt on Judge Wood were one and the same part of a planned operation. I do not think there is any question and nobody debates that it was a very sophisticated form of organized crime that was actually responsible.

But the main thing that impelled me and continues to impel me to bring this before the House of Representatives as a national issue is that it is the first overt, direct attempt on the third branch of our Government, the judiciary, in what is obvious to me to be an attempt to intimidate and coerce that branch of Government. The sad part is that no more progress has been made in resolving that crime today, almost 3 years later, than there was when I first rose to speak here at the opening of the last Congress after the attack on the assistant district attorney, James W. Kerr.

This is so insidious, and it is such a challenge, particularly to the policymaking body of this country. After all, under the Constitution, if there is one of the three co-equal branches of the Government that is perhaps more dependent on another branch such as this, the first branch, it is the judiciary because, after all, the Constitution provides for the Congress to set up and give the framework of reference, the meat and veins and life to the skeleton known as the judiciary system.

What I am saying is that this is the first direct attack of this nature. It is the first crime of this type in the history of the American judiciary.

What I am further saying is that it further shows the absolute imperviousness of organized crime to any kind of minimal control by our law enforcement agencies, either on the national, State, or local level, and particularly the national level where I have been speaking out since 1970, and have been speaking out because the very, very able and sophisticated forms of this crime have been so successful that they have penetrated the highest levels of our Government. There would not be the pattern of crime such as is besetting us today if we did not have some kind of an intimate connection between crime and business and the political branch all the way from the national down to the lowest level. If we did not have this intricate relationship, we would not have the horrendous control that

King Crime has undaunted over our society at this time.

I have said repeatedly that I have foresworn to continue this until there is some revelation of direct concern on the part of this body. I have introduced a resolution which has received little or no support. I still believe it is as needed today as the day I introduced it. That resolution merely expressed the sense of the House of Representatives that it is our wish and sense that the President allocate out of the resources appropriated by the Congress to the Justice Department an amount not to exceed \$3 million for a reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of those responsible for the attacks on James Kerr and the murder of Judge Wood.

I have been laughed at, ridiculed, except by the knowledgeable people in law enforcement and some of those with whom I have had a great, happy association through the years since I myself was involved in law enforcement many, many years ago. At first glance it does look as if perhaps there would be no cause and effect, but the truth of the matter is that even the meager attempts to resolve the case, at least superficially, which have led to spasmodic, big headlines involving first the formation of a special grand jury, which was not formed until after I had raised my voice and gotten a little bit of reaction here, obtained an audience with the President's domestic adviser and representatives from the Drug Enforcement Agency and from the Justice Department, but we never did get the national, concerted level action that these crimes deserve and demand as a matter of priority.

I have said that I would not stand idly by and see this crime fade into the dust of history to be forgotten, very much like the disappearance of Jimmy Hoffa. I do not think anybody in or out of officialdom says that Jimmy Hoffa's disappearance was anything but a crime and that he was murdered, though the body has not even been found. There is nobody who contradicts the out-and-out allegation that organized crime was responsible for that one.

In the case of Judge Wood and in the case of the attempt on James Kerr, even the most cynical of law enforcement agents will agree that it was a very well prepared and highly planned act in both cases. In fact, so well prepared that only a few cases have been made, and, as I say and repeat, in each instance it was with great alarums, in fact too much publicity, and perhaps it is understandable because the law enforcement agents and the prosecutorial agents are on the defensive, and they have been desperate. In fact, I think that they exceeded themselves in getting the type of publicity on a couple of occasions, that they have. I think they have endan-

gered any possibility of real successful prosecution. But what has been unobtainable and, again, with great ado, has been convictions. First it was assumed, and it was publicized that it was some of these known as the gangs on the motorcycles, the banditos. Then that faded and in the last year we had great publicity about prosecutions of a man and then his wife, and even in jurisdictions outside of it on a change of venue of the scene of the crime. But even at best they have been accused not as accomplices in the crime or perpetrators of the crime, but with some subsidiary charges such as having bought illegal weapons. Even the weapons have not been susceptible of being proved as associated with the commission of the crimes.

So what we mean is that we are ending up at square one as of 2½ years ago, to the great detriment of the national interests, in my opinion. Today I am merely reaffirming my intention to keep on as best as one man can to keep attention on this crime with everything within my individual power to see that it leads eventually to a resolution. I think that the destiny of this country is symbolized in the matter of the successful resolution of this type of crime.

As I say, it has unprecedented features, and for that reason I am convinced that it has more than local or sectional but, rather, national importance, and should have national priority. That is the main impelling motivation behind my taking the time of my colleagues in this body.

I will add that it is disturbing that rather than acting either on the budget or any other of the collateral actions of this last year, rather than helping to shore up the agencies—without whose shoring up these crimes will not be resolved but, rather, the other way around—we have, in effect, wittingly or unwittingly, added to the disintegration, at least in the funding, of the viable agencies that must be at work. In fact, my impulse has been to try to add, not detract, as a matter of priority, so that at last our legally constituted authorities will at least have a chance when they confront this giant known as King Crime.

I can see why it is impossible until we break the stranglehold and this tremendous interlocking of the interests between the political, the business, and organized crime. There is no question that organized crime has penetrated every level of business endeavor in this country from motels to franchise dealers, you name it. In fact, I also correlated one of the initial causes leading to the death of Judge Wood as the tremendous burgeoning trade, the illicit trade, in the international stolen car market that mushroomed in a matter of less than 1 year from a few-hundred-million-dollar thing to over a \$3 billion business

today, mostly into Mexico in exchange for drugs that have not been at all either curbed or reduced in their introduction into our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that somehow, in some way, I can get the attention of my colleagues and pass the resolution. After all, we are not appropriating money; we are expressing that it is the sense of this House that this demands this kind of priority. Then it is up to the executive branch to use its judgment as to whether it wants to give these crimes the priority they merit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE 1982 ELECTION YEAR MAILING RESTRICTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, with the 1982 election year rapidly approaching, the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards wishes to remind Members of the House of the franking statutes, rules, and regulations governing mass mailings by candidates prior to elections.

Generally, Members of the House seeking reelection are prohibited from sending franked mass mailings during the 60-day period immediately before the date of any public election—whether primary, general, special, or runoff—in which such Member's name appears on the ballot.

Further, any Member who is a candidate for other public office may not frank mass mailings outside of the congressional district from which the Member was elected, beginning at the time the Member is certified for candidacy.

Members should insure that staff persons responsible for mass mailings are knowledgeable of State election laws as they affect mailing privileges during the period prior to primary and general election periods. Members' staff seeking advisory opinions from the Commission must certify that, to the best of their knowledge, the frankability of the proposed mailing is not adversely affected by applicable State election law.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of compliance with these regulations. I urge my colleagues to assure that their staffs are familiar with the statutes, Rules of the House, and pertinent regulations and guidelines governing the proper use of the franking privilege.

The Commission staff is ready to assist in every possible way.

A detailed explanation of the mass mailing provisions, along with a listing of cutoff dates for the congressional

primaries in the various States, follows:

LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF THE FRANK BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

39 U.S.C. 3210 (a)(6)(A) provides that, "It is the intent of Congress that a Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress may not mail any mass mailing as franked mail—

(i) if the mass mailing is mailed fewer than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary election or general election (whether regular, special or runoff) in which the Member is a candidate for re-election; or

(ii) in the case of a Member of, or Member-elect to, the House who is a candidate for any other public office, if the mass mailing—

(I) is prepared for delivery within any portion of the jurisdiction of or the area covered by the public office which is outside the area constituting the congressional district from which the Member or Member-elect was elected; or

(II) is mailed fewer than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary election or general election (whether regular, special or runoff) in which the Member-elect is a candidate for any other public office.

Mailings made through the facilities of the House Distribution Service (Folding Room) shall be deemed in compliance with this statute if such mailings are delivered to the House Folding Room not less than 62 days before the date of such election, with instructions for immediate dispatch.

DEFINITIONS

Mass mailings

Mass mailings are defined by law [39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(5)(D)] as newsletters and other similar mailings of more than 500 pieces in which the content of the matter mailed is substantially identical. Mail matter is deemed to be a mass mailing when the total number of pieces exceeds 500, whether in a single mailing or in cumulative mailings during the 60-day period.

Candidate for election or reelection to the House of Representatives

For purposes of the subject statutes and regulations, a Member of or a Member-elect to the House of Representatives is deemed to be a candidate for public office at any election if his or her name appears anywhere on any official ballot to be used in a public election.

Candidate for "any other public office"

For the purpose of 39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(6)(A)(ii), "any other public office" means any State or Federal office, other than a U.S. Representative at Large for which the candidate would be elected by a majority of votes cast. (Examples: President, Governor, U.S. Senator, State Supreme Court Justice, State Senator at Large, Assemblyman at Large, Mayor, etc.) "Candidate" means a Member who has qualified under State law, for the official ballot in a primary, runoff, special, or general election, or who has been certified for candidacy by an appropriate State election official.

EXCEPTIONS

The subject statutes, rules, and regulations provide three exceptions to the mass mail prohibition prior to elections, as follows:

(i) (mailings) which are in direct response to inquiries or requests from the persons to whom the matter is mailed;

(ii) (mailings) to colleagues in Congress or to government officials (whether Federal, State, or local); and

(iii) (mailings) of news releases to the communications media.

The Commission believes the last two exceptions are self-explanatory.

In application of the first exception, the Commission stresses the phrase "direct response to inquiries or requests". Therefore, response to a signed petition with a form or identical letter individually addressed to each of the signers of the petition is frankable. However, a follow-up letter to the same list of petitioners is not frankable under this section in that it would not be in direct response to an inquiry.

Similarly, follow-up letters to persons who had previously written and had been answered on a particular subject, if such letters by their form and volume constitute a mass mailing, are not frankable during the 60-day period prior to elections. Also, requests for questionnaire results or other material, when solicited by Members on questionnaire forms or newsletters, are not deemed to be in direct response to any inquiry or request.

The above restrictions on mass mailings by candidates do not apply to mass mailings by the chairman of any standing, select, joint or other official committee of the Congress, or subcommittee thereof, and which relate to the normal business of the committee. [39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(6)(B)]

TIME OF MAILING

Processing by a postal facility

Mass mailings as defined under 39 U.S.C. 3210(a)(5)(D), may not be mailed as franked mail by a Member of or a Member-elect to the House of Representatives when the same is mailed at or delivered to any postal facility other than the Publications Distribution Service of the House of Representatives, hereinafter referred to as the House folding room, less than 60 days immediately before the date of any primary or general election (whether regular, special, or runoff) in which such Member or Member-elect is a candidate for any public office.

Processing by the House folding room

Such mass mailings, if processed through the House folding room, shall be deemed to be in compliance with the subject rule and these regulations, if delivered to the House folding room, with instructions for immediate dispatch, not less than 62 days immediately before the date of any such election. In the case of mass mailings delivered to the House folding room prior to the 62-day cutoff period, the requirement of instructions for "immediate dispatch" may be modified to the extent that instructions are given for delivery of the mailing to the addressee not later than the 60th day immediately before the date of such election.

The House folding room shall issue a receipt, which shall specify the date and time of delivery and a brief description of the matter to be processed, to the Member at the time he or she delivers such mass mailings to the House folding room.

ALPHABETICAL LIST BY STATE

State	Date	60-day cutoff (postal facility)	62-day cutoff (folding room)
1982 congressional primary dates:			
Alabama	Sept. 7	July 9	July 7
Alaska	Aug. 24	June 25	June 23
Arizona	Sept. 7	July 9	July 7
Arkansas	May 25	Mar. 26	Mar. 24

ALPHABETICAL LIST BY STATE—Continued

State	Date	60-day cutoff (postal facility)	62-day cutoff (folding room)
California	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Colorado	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
Connecticut	Sept. 7	July 9	July 7
Delaware	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Florida	Sept. 7	July 9	July 7
Georgia	Aug. 10	June 11	June 9
Hawaii	Sept. 18	July 20	July 18
Idaho	May 25	Mar. 26	Mar. 24
Illinois	Mar. 16	Jan. 15	Jan. 13
Indiana	May 4	Mar. 5	Mar. 3
Iowa	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Kansas	Aug. 3	June 4	June 2
Kentucky	May 25	Mar. 26	Mar. 24
Louisiana	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Maine	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Maryland	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
Massachusetts	do	do	do
Michigan	Aug. 3	June 4	June 2
Minnesota	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
Mississippi	June 1	Apr. 2	Mar. 31
Missouri	Aug. 3	June 4	June 2
Montana	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Nebraska	May 11	Mar. 12	Mar. 10
Nevada	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
New Hampshire	do	do	do
New Jersey	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
New Mexico	June 1	Apr. 2	Mar. 31
New York	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
North Carolina	May 4	Mar. 5	Mar. 3
North Dakota	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Ohio	do	do	do
Oklahoma	Aug. 24	June 25	June 23
Oregon	May 18	Mar. 19	Mar. 17
Pennsylvania	do	do	do
Rhode Island	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
South Carolina	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
South Dakota	June 1	Apr. 2	Mar. 31
Tennessee	Aug. 5	June 6	June 4
Texas	May 1	Mar. 2	Feb. 28
Utah	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
Vermont	do	do	do
Virginia	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Washington	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
West Virginia	June 1	Apr. 2	Mar. 31
Wisconsin	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
American Samoa	do	do	do
District of Columbia	do	do	do
Guam	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
Puerto Rico	do	do	do
Virgin Islands	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
1982 general election.	Nov. 2	Sept. 3	Sept. 1

Note: The 60-day and 62-day cutoff regulations also apply to runoff elections in which the Member is a candidate.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST BY ELECTION DATES

State	Date	60-day cutoff (postal facility)	62-day cutoff (folding room)
1982 congressional primary dates:			
Illinois	Mar. 16	Jan. 15	Jan. 13
Texas	May 1	Mar. 2	Feb. 28
Indiana	May 4	Mar. 5	Mar. 3
North Carolina	do	do	do
Nebraska	May 11	Mar. 12	Mar. 10
Oregon	May 18	Mar. 19	Mar. 17
Pennsylvania	do	do	do
Arkansas	May 25	Mar. 26	Mar. 24
Idaho	do	do	do
Kentucky	do	do	do
Mississippi	June 1	Apr. 2	Mar. 31
New Mexico	do	do	do
South Dakota	do	do	do
West Virginia	do	do	do
California	June 8	Apr. 9	Apr. 7
Iowa	do	do	do
Maine	do	do	do
Montana	do	do	do
New Jersey	do	do	do
North Dakota	do	do	do
Ohio	do	do	do
South Carolina	do	do	do
Virginia	do	do	do
Kansas	Aug. 3	June 4	June 2
Michigan	do	do	do
Missouri	do	do	do
Tennessee	Aug. 5	June 6	June 4
Georgia	Aug. 10	June 11	June 9
Alaska	Aug. 24	June 25	June 23
Oklahoma	do	do	do
Guam	Sept. 4	July 6	July 4
Alabama	Sept. 7	July 9	July 7
Arizona	do	do	do
Connecticut	do	do	do
Florida	do	do	do
Delaware	Sept. 11	July 13	July 11
Louisiana	do	do	do

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST BY ELECTION DATES—Continued

State	Date	60-day cutoff (postal facility)	62-day cutoff (folding room)
District of Columbia	Sept. 14	July 16	July 14
Colorado	do	do	Do.
Maryland	do	do	Do.
Massachusetts	do	do	Do.
Minnesota	do	do	Do.
Nevada	do	do	Do.
New Hampshire	do	do	Do.
New York	do	do	Do.
Rhode Island	do	do	Do.
Vermont	do	do	Do.
Washington	do	do	Do.
Wisconsin	do	do	Do.
Wyoming	do	do	Do.
Utah	do	do	Do.
Virgin Islands	do	do	Do.
American Samoa	do	do	Do.
Hawaii	Sept. 18	July 20	July 18
1982 general election	Nov. 2	Sept. 3	Sept. 1

Note: The 60-day and 62-day cutoff regulations also apply to runoff elections in which the Member is a candidate. ●

FEDERALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to continue a discussion that I began last fall on a subject which was the centerpiece of President Reagan's state of the Union address last night. I began to discuss the matter of federalism as an important issue that faces this Nation in very specific terms during the last months of 1981.

I did so, Mr. Speaker, because for many years, I have been a very strong believer in the concept of federalism and the need for its renewal and its reinvigoration in this Nation. Indeed, the single most important contribution to political institutions which the United States has given birth to is the sense of federalism, is the concept and the constitutional doctrine of federalism.

The concept of federalism was given new life a number of years ago by those decisions of the courts calling for the reapportionment of State legislative bodies to make them more representative and more responsive to the needs of the people.

□ 1630

As a result of the emergence of strong and representative State governments, we were once again able to reestablish the importance and the viability of State and local government.

I think most Americans believe that there is no more wisdom, no more integrity, no more efficiency in Washington, to say the very least, than there is in those State capitals or city halls and county commission court-houses around the Nation. Indeed, there is a very strong feeling that government closest to the problem, as well as closest to the people, is best equipped to make the proper response to the needs that people have in those areas and with respect to those issues

and problems which are not, by their inherent nature, national in scope.

President Reagan said last night—and I think quite well—that it is a very sad situation to find that most people today, most citizens today, are concerned that they have to go to Washington rather than to their State or local governments to get decisions about essential services of government, such as schools, welfare, and even garbage collection.

I think the President, in that sense, was absolutely right. And over the last several years—not just beginning this last year, but over the last several years—there has been a redirection of more responsibility, more decision-making to the State governments.

But what began to concern me last year, as I listened to spokesmen for the administration outline their concept of federalism, what they called "new federalism," it occurred to me that there was something perhaps missing and something lurking that could even be harmful and dangerous, and that was not simply a return of appropriate responsibilities to local and State government, but simply a shifting of tax burdens back to citizens and back to their State and local governments. If federalism is no more than shifting taxes back to other layers of government, we have not achieved a great deal. We certainly have not reduced the tax burden on the backs of the American people. We have just made that burden payable to a different tax collector.

My concerns were, unfortunately, confirmed during hearings which our Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations had last year on the subject of federalism. We requested that the administration send over a spokesman to present this administration's concept and understanding of new federalism. And that spokesman was the Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, designated by the administration to explain their sense of new federalism. During the course of questioning of Secretary Watt, I asked him the question, after listening to his explanation, and he said, in response to my question—and it is a matter of record—that, yes, federalism means raising local property taxes. That is what it means. Later, just a few weeks later, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Norman Ture, speaking on behalf of the administration, went even further, and he said that there were going to be no new resources provided for State and local governments to meet these new responsibilities, except, he said, the tax reduction which Congress voted for the American taxpayers last year.

Now, I supported that tax reduction, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that Americans are just as able or better able, to make decisions about how to spend or save their money than Feder-

al bureaucrats. I believe that the purpose of that tax cut, Mr. Speaker, was for the purpose of either relieving the tax burden on the backs of the American people or to provide the investments and the savings necessary to spur productivity in the American economy. And yet if those tax reduction funds are not going to be available for the purpose of providing tax relief or providing savings and investment in the private sector, because they are going to get sucked up by increased local taxes, as spokesmen for the Reagan administration have advocated, then it makes a mockery out of the tax cut and assures the failure of its purpose.

Last night, as I heard the explanation for the first time of this new federalism program, I again began to wonder: Is it really new federalism? Or is it, rather, what I describe as "neo-new federalism," which simply means raising taxes on the backs of State and local taxpayers who, by the way, are the same people who pay Federal taxes. And as I analyzed the speech last night, my concerns grew.

The President in his speech last night said, and I quote:

Let us solve this problem with a single bold stroke—the return of some \$47 billion in Federal programs to State and local government, together with the means to finance them and a transition period of nearly 10 years to avoid unnecessary disruption.

So there we heard about the return of \$47 billion in costs to your State and to your local governments.

And then I waited to hear where the return of resources was coming from. About two pages later, in the speech, the President said, and I quote again:

In 1984, the Federal Government will apply the full proceeds from certain excise taxes to a grassroots trust fund that will belong, in fair shares, to the 50 States. The total amount flowing into this fund will be \$28 billion a year.

Now, simple arithmetic tells me that between \$47 billion of additional costs and \$28 billion of additional resources, there is a \$19 billion gap that is going to come out of the hides and the pockets of Americans through payments of State and local taxes.

Neo-new federalism will not mean a reduction of taxes. It will simply mean shifting the envelope that you send your tax check in, instead of to the Internal Revenue Collector at the Federal level, to your State and local tax collectors.

But even more, as I began to analyze some of the areas of return responsibility without resources, I began to find out that there are some areas in which people back home, people in our communities, are going to feel the full brunt of the neo-new federalism.

The Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, which I chair, has responsibilities for, among other things,

the water pollution control program. Last year we analyzed the impact of the return of these responsibilities to State and local governments under the proposed legislation which the administration introduced. And we went out to different places around the country and asked questions. In one particular hearing that we had in Austin, Tex., where we heard officials from a number of communities throughout that State, where we heard testimony from members of chambers of commerce and other groups, we found out that neo-new federalism, in returning responsibilities without returning resources, would result in great increases on water bills in the State of Texas. In those communities which testified, the range of increase was from 60 to 300 percent.

Now, it is very difficult to explain to a person how they have saved any money in a tax reduction if they are going to have to pay it out in higher sales taxes, higher property taxes, higher State income taxes, and higher water and sewer bills around the country.

The President, in his program, has even discussed reducing drastically Federal revenue sharing. Federal revenue-sharing was a means by which local property taxes could be kept down. The reduction or elimination of this program will have only one consequence, and that is raising local taxes. That is neo-new federalism. It is not just a matter of placing responsibility where it ought to be, in my opinion, but it must also be accompanied by the resources which will provide the ability of State and local governments to meet these needs and discharge these responsibilities without raising the regressive taxes that we face at the State and local levels.

Mr. Speaker, the explanations we have thus far heard of this program are not the final word, and I am prepared to give the administration a chance to present its program in full. There are a lot of unanswered questions. There are some things which the President indicated in the state of the Union message on federalism that have great merit. I am pleased to note that they have adopted in their program a concept which I advocated; in fact, I sponsored an amendment which was enacted into law several years ago in the general revenue-sharing legislation, which said that States, in order to receive their revenue-sharing portion, could opt to pay back or forgo categorical programs and thereby receive revenue sharing. They could spend the general revenue-sharing moneys at their discretion—where their priorities were, where the needs which they identified were. And, these expenditures could be administered better at the local and State levels than they could be at the Federal level. This concept, I see with a great

deal of satisfaction, is included in the administration's program. But, Mr. Speaker, I think we have got to be extremely careful as we look at the concept of federalism or new federalism to make certain that it becomes something more than neo-new federalism, which is a back-door way, indeed, perhaps, almost a dishonest way, of raising taxes on the American people on the one hand, when they had been promised tax relief and tax reduction on the other hand. I think we are going to have to take a very hard, long, constructive, and cooperative look at the new federalism program to assure that it becomes something more than neo-new federalism—and thus far, those signals in that program have not been sent.

I am hoping, as the administration develops this program, that it becomes something more than a sham of an offer of returning responsibilities back to State and local officials, and that it becomes a real meaningful program so that these types of problems which are best dealt with in the city hall, in the county commission, and in the State legislature can be dealt with there.

I hope this becomes a meaningful program and not simply a sham to raise taxes collected by other levels of government or to dismantle programs that have served the people of this Nation well.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to the days ahead during the second session of the 97th Congress, I once again raise this cautionary word about federalism: We need federalism; we need to place more responsibility in our State governments and in our local governments. But we better do it honestly and we better do it rationally and not simply tell the people one thing and do something else.

When people get their tax bills this year and next year from their State governments and their local governments and begin to get their water and sewer bills from their local authorities, they are going to ask the question: Where did this come from? And I think the question better be one that Members of this House can answer honestly when they go back.

Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this House, I intend to work cooperatively with the administration in developing a real program of new federalism and work just as hard to defeat efforts to bring about a neo-new federalism, which is nothing more than a sham.

COMPREHENSIVE REFORM OF FORFEITURE LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a comprehensive

reform of the forfeiture laws. The bill I have developed is the result of a thorough examination of the problems confronted by prosecutors in their attempts to take the profits out of drug dealing.

One of the single most important crime problems confronting this country is phenomenal increase in drug trafficking in recent years. We are now faced with a situation where drug dealers have been able to amass huge fortunes as a result of their illegal activities. The sad truth is that the financial penalties for drug dealing are frequently only seen by dealers as a cost of doing business. Under current law the maximum fine for many serious drug offenses is only \$25,000. Moreover, the Government's ability to obtain civil or criminal forfeiture of the profits or proceeds of drug dealing has been hampered by statutory deficiencies. This bill attempts to address these problems in a manner that will encourage the immediate and effective utilization of these new tools by law enforcement.

At the outset I must acknowledge the material assistance I have received in this undertaking from my Congressional colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Senators JOSEPH BIDEN and SAM NUNN both have diligently pursued investigations of the problems with drug prosecutions. As a result of work done in the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, the area of forfeiture has emerged as a primary concern on the Federal law enforcement community.

At the suggestion of Senator BIDEN, the General Accounting Office did a ground breaking study of the problems in disgorging the profits of drug dealers. See, "Asset Forfeiture—A Seldom Used Tool in Combatting Drug Trafficking," GGD-81-5 (April 10, 1981). The Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, followed up on the GAO report with a hearing on forfeiture during the first session of this Congress. At our first hearing we were able to review the bills of my colleagues HAL SAWYER, LEO ZEFERETTI, and BEN GILMAN (H.R. 2646, H.R. 4110, and H.R. 2910, respectively). Each of these gentlemen presented the subcommittee with innovative options on the reform of our forfeiture laws. The bill I am introducing today is the direct descendant of the bills they introduced earlier in this Congress.

An overview of the problems with the current forfeiture statutes by Government officials produces a clear consensus about the need for change. What is less clear is the path to achieve that reform. Most observers agree that prosecutors face three major problems: Ambiguous statutes,

problems in tracing the proceeds of drug trafficking, and difficulties in proof. The solutions to these dilemmas are numerous and pursuit of them can often create a divergence of views. For example, while it may be desirable to ease Government seizure of property involving drug trafficking, one must also be careful to protect the rights of innocent third parties. Frequently, it is these conflicting values that produce different opinions about the wisdom of particular legislative reforms.

In the legislation I am introducing today I have attempted to balance the strong societal interest in eradicating trafficking in illegal drugs with the constitutional rights of our citizens. I am satisfied that a proper balance has been struck, I look forward to hearing the assessments of interested parties on this bill. Anyone with views on this legislation should communicate directly with me or through the Subcommittee on Crime, Committee on the Judiciary, 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 or telephone (202) 225-1695. The Subcommittee on Crime will hold hearings on this bill early in the second session. Anyone wishing to testify should contact the subcommittee.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DRUG PENALTY ACT OF 1981

This bill makes numerous changes in the substantive law of forfeiture. In addition, the bill makes numerous procedural changes in the methods of handling forfeiture cases. Finally, the bill increases the maximum fine penalties for drug offenses. The increased use of forfeiture and criminal fines will be an important first step in the diminution of drug trafficking in the United States. A sectional analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION BY SECTION DESCRIPTION

Section 1: Contains the short title of the bill: "Comprehensive Drug Penalty Act of 1981."

Section 2: Amends section 1963 of title 18 in two major ways. This section in current law contains the authorization for criminal forfeiture in cases under the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (so-called RICO cases). Under current law the courts have consistently held that the Congress did not intend to authorize the criminal forfeiture of the profits or proceeds of an enterprise acquired or maintained through racketeering activity. See *United States v. Marubeni American Corporation*, 611 F.2d 763 (9th Cir. 1980); *United States v. Mannino*, 480 F. Supp. 1182 (S.D.N.Y. 1980), aff'd on other grounds, 635 F.2d 110, 118 (2nd Cir. 1980); *United States v. Thevis*, 474 F. Supp. 134 (N.D. Ga. 1979). This section authorizes the government to seek criminal forfeiture of profits or proceeds in two new instances.

First, 18 U.S.C. 1963 is amended to reach the profits or proceeds of persons involved in racketeering activities consisting of certain narcotics or dangerous drug offenses. The net result of this amendment will be to make it parallel with 21 U.S.C. 881 (which authorizes civil forfeiture of such property). The second part of this section of the bill

allows the government to seek criminal forfeiture of the profits or proceeds of an enterprise engaged in illegal activities insofar as they are derived from an interest, security, claim or right in such enterprise when that interest, security, claim or right was previously acquired or maintained through racketeering activity. The net result of this amendment would be to accommodate the result sought in proposed section 1963(c) of H.R. 4110, without overturning the result in *Marubeni American Corp.* with respect to legitimate businesses.

Section 3: Amends section 1963(c) by establishing a procedure for the seizure and disposition of property subject to criminal forfeiture. The provisions are modeled after sections 8101-03 of H.R. 6915, approved by the Committee last Congress. See H. Rept. 96-1396, pages 575-579.

This section authorizes the court to take into account the rights of alleged innocent third parties. Under current law such persons are without effective opportunity for judicial review of forfeiture decisions. For example, in *United States v. L'Hoste*, 609 F.2d 796 (5th Cir.) cert. denied, 419 U.S. 1165 (1980) the Fifth Circuit held that once property has been determined to have been involved in the racketeering activity, innocent third parties must petition the Attorney General for equitable relief. The inadequacy of current law is further highlighted by the last episode from the *Marvin Mandel* case. In that case it took nearly five years after the criminal trial before an innocent third party obtained limited judicial review. *United States v. Mandel*, 505 F.2d 189 (D.Md. 1981).

Thus, this section provides a mechanism for judicial review of forfeiture actions insofar as they affect allegedly innocent third parties. Inclusion of this procedure is in response to the suggestions of the General Accounting Office and the Department of Justice. See General Accounting Office, "Asset Forfeiture," GGD-81-51, April 10, 1981, at 36-38, and 79.

The section envisions three ways that the government could obtain property subject to forfeiture. First, the government could obtain a court order if they established probable cause to believe that the property to be seized is subject to forfeiture. See *O'Reilly v. United States*, 486 F.2d 208 (8th Cir. 1973) (a warrant is required for a seizure under 21 U.S.C. 881(b)). Second, it could seize property incident to an arrest so long as the seizure meets other constitutional standards. See generally "Note: The Forfeiture Exception to the Warrant Requirement," 67 Virg. L. Rev. 1035 (1981); See also *United States v. Pappas*, 613 F.2d 324 (1st Cir. 1980) (a seizure warrant is required for property found in a public place.) Third, the government could obtain custody of the property through some other means such as abandonment or tax seizures and the like. Once the property is in custody of the government the trier of fact may order the property forfeited if the government meets its burden by establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that such property is forfeitable. Under current law the courts have read the existing criminal forfeiture procedures as requiring that the government establish its forfeiture claims beyond a reasonable doubt.

This reading by the courts does not appear to be required as a matter of constitutional law. Rather, the courts have merely misconstrued the initial Congressional intent in the 1970 Act.

Section 3 of the bill also changes current law by permitting the seizure of property at

the time the indictment or information is filed. Under current law the government is required to state in the indictment or information that forfeiture is sought. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 7(e). However, seizure of such property is only authorized upon conviction. 18 U.S.C. 1963(c).

Section 4: Amends section 1963 of title 18 by setting forth a presumption that property obtained by large-scale drug traffickers was obtained illegally and thus is subject to forfeiture. The impetus for this provision is found in H.R. 2646 (by Mr. Sawyer). This section draws upon the practice in criminal tax evasion cases of using the defendant's net worth to establish the government's case.

This amendment would create a presumption of forfeitability once the government has established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that three circumstances exist. The circumstances are that: (1) the defendant acquired the property after the alleged racketeering activity began; (2) the racketeering involved a Class I or II violation;¹ and (3) there is no likely source for the property other than the racketeering activity.

The circumstances set forth above appear to be necessary amendments to the provisions set forth in H.R. 2646 in light of various Supreme Court cases. Assistant Attorney General Lowell Jensen has indicated to the Subcommittee there must be both a rational connection between the facts proven and the conclusions inferred from that proof. In addition, there must be a legislative basis for the presumption. Insofar as the legislative record on forfeiture has only addressed the issue of large-scale drug traffickers, the presumption seems appropriately limited to those cases.

The limitations on the application of the presumption would appear to meet the objections to H.R. 2646 raised by various of the witnesses. For example, the Department of Justice witness, Edward Dennis, suggested that the presumption be limited to circumstances where the government has established that the property involved was acquired after the alleged racketeering activity began.

The provision of the proposed amendment relating to proof with respect to other possible sources for the property is derived directly from the "net worth" tax cases. Before the government may obtain a conviction of a person for tax evasion it must establish that there was no other likely explanation for the income. *Davis v. United States*, 226 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1955). This approach has proven workable in the tax area. There is also some indication that the Supreme Court would look with disfavor on a less rigorous test. *Holland v. United States*, 348 U.S. 121, 125-9 (1954).

The consequences of this presumption are straightforward. Once the government has met its burden of proof with respect to the three circumstances the trier of fact is permitted to find that property is subject to forfeiture. Any attempt to mandate forfeiture upon proof of the facts set forth in proposed section 1963(d) would raise very serious constitutional problems. Both Assistant Attorney General Jensen and Professor Rothstein (in testimony before the Subcommittee) point out that any such mandatory presumption would probably run afoul of

¹ Class I and II violations are terms of art used by the Drug Enforcement Administration to classify major drug traffickers.

the Supreme Court's decision in *Ulster County Court, New York v. Allen*, 442 U.S. 140 (1979).

Section 4 of the bill also contains three significant procedural changes from current law. Subsection (f) provides that if any transfer of property was made with knowledge, or reason to know, that the transfer was being made to avoid forfeiture, then such transfer is void. Under current law the government must rely on various State statutes against fraudulent transfers to avoid transactions of this type. *United States v. One 1967 Chris-Craft 27 Foot Fiber Glass Boat*, 423 F.2d 1293 (5th Cir. 1970); *U.S. v. Currency Totalling \$48,318.08*, 609 F.2d 210, 213.4 (5th Cir. 1980). Enactment of this uniform Federal rule would help prevent sham transfers made solely for the purpose of evading criminal forfeiture. In addition, this section protects the rights of bona fide purchasers for value.

Subsection (g) of section 4 provides that a person who is convicted of a RICO violation cannot buy back the property he or she forfeited. The original purpose of the criminal forfeiture provisions, and indeed of the whole Act, was to prevent the infiltration of legitimate businesses by organized crime. Assuming the continued validity of that purpose it seems to make no sense to allow the continued involvement in a legitimate business of a convicted racketeer by allowing him or her to buy back the forfeited property. The effect of this subsection would be to preclude the result of the *Huber* case where a convicted white collar criminal repurchased, after conviction of a mail fraud related RICO violation, his interest in some hospital. *United States v. Huber*, 603 F.2d 387, 397 (2nd Cir. 1979); See also *United States v. Barone*, Cr. No. 78-185-CR-WHH (S.D. Fla. Oct. 17).

Finally, subsection (h) of section 4 of the bill provides that any criminal forfeiture action under this section may be the basis of a motion to seek a stay of any pending civil forfeiture action with respect to the same property. This appears to be the result that courts normally reach under current law. U.S. Department of Justice Drug Enforcement Administration, "Drug Agent's Guide to Forfeiture of Assets," at 233 (1981). This provision was recommended by the Department of Justice, which feared that defendants would use the discovery authorized in the civil forfeiture case to require production of non-Jencks material relative to the criminal case.

Section 5: Amends section 1964 by authorizing the courts to enter restraining orders preventing the transfer of property that is, or may be, the subject of a forfeiture proceeding. Current law, 18 U.S.C. 1963(b), authorizes the issuance of a restraining order after indictment. The courts have divided on the question of the government's burden of proof.² Because this relief is drastic and

occurs before arrest or indictment, and can affect the rights of innocent third parties, the government is required by this section of the bill to make the same kind of showing that is required in cases involving a civil preliminary injunction.

The Department of Justice suggested that a restraint on transfer provisions be added to the bill. Their recommendation included a suggestion that such relief could be without notice to the affected parties. The bill does not, however, allow for *ex parte* applications for this type of relief for several reasons. First, the bill authorizes the seizure of the property at the time of the filing of an indictment or information. Thus, the only cases where this section would come into play would be before an indictment or information had been filed. Second, any transfers made to avoid forfeiture are voidable by the court. Third, there is a line of Supreme Court cases that can be read to require, as a matter of due process, prior notice and opportunity to be heard before such substantial interference with property rights is allowed.³ *Memphis Light, Gas & Water Division v. Craft*, 98 S. Ct. 1554 (1978); *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 92 S. Ct. 1983 (1972); and *Tarlow*, at 300-4.

Section 6: Amends section 848 of title 21 to allow the government to seek the criminal forfeiture of the profits or proceeds of a person convicted of operating a continuing criminal enterprise. This amendment parallels the one made in section 2 of the bill with respect to 18 U.S.C. 1963.

Section 7: Amends section 848 to require that civil forfeiture actions are stayed by the initiation of a criminal forfeiture action under section 848 with respect to the same property. This amendment parallels one made earlier in the bill with respect to 18 U.S.C. 1963.

Section 8: Amends section 881 of title 21 to permit the civil forfeiture of land and buildings used, or intended to be used, for holding or storage of dangerous drugs. Current law is unclear as to whether warehouses or other buildings can be forfeited. Current law only reaches "containers". The Justice Department is worried that a defendant may claim that a warehouse is not a container. This amendment resolves that concern.

Section 9: Amends section 881 to create a Drug Enforcement Fund. This amendment does not actually create such a fund, because an appropriation act is required after this bill is enacted.

The idea of a revolving fund was taken from the suggestions of Congressman Gilman (H.R. 2910) and Congressman Sawyer (H.R. 2646). Similar funds are found in the recent reform of the Patent Office, Public Law 96-517, and with respect to certain fisheries funds. The proposed fund has a ten million dollar ceiling.

The source of the money for the fund would be the proceeds returned to the government as the result of forfeiture actions. The ostensible reason for the creation of this fund is to encourage the Drug Enforcement Administration to more aggressively pursue forfeiture actions. In theory the

fund would be an addition to the agency's regular appropriation and would, therefore, serve as a reward for increased forfeiture activities.

The fund authorized by this section allows the Attorney General to spend the money set aside for any drug law enforcement purpose. Some of the previous legislative proposals have limited the use of the fund to the purchase of evidence or information (H.R. 2910) or to use by State and local law enforcement officials (H.R. 2646). This bill does not include these limits, because it seemed more appropriate to permit the Attorney General to resolve these issues.

Section 10: Amends twelve sections of title 21 drug offenses by increasing the maximum criminal fines. The new maximum fine levels were derived in large part from the scale used in the version of the proposed criminal code approved by the Committee last Congress. See section 3502 of H.R. 6915 and H. Rept. 96-1396 at 465-9. In some instances the maximum fines exceed one million dollars in order to maintain the penalty structure of the existing statute (i.e. to allow for a penalty twice as large for a second offense).

The rationale for the amendments relating to fine levels is straightforward. To many drug traffickers the costs associated with the criminal justice system are merely a cost of doing business. These amendments attempt to raise the ante. While changes in the law with respect to forfeiture are desirable, they may not permit the government to deter criminal conduct sufficiently. As numerous witnesses before various Congressional committees have clearly established, the use of forfeiture procedures is very cumbersome and time consuming. Money is difficult to trace in forfeiture cases. In procedural questions with respect to the rights of innocent third parties. Resolution of these procedural problems may make forfeiture actions even more complex. Thus, the availability of higher fines will offer yet another weapon to the government in its efforts to take the profit out of crime.

This section of the bill also adds two new sections that authorize the court to impose an alternative fine equal to twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense. One of the new sections sets forth procedures for the imposition of such fines, including considerations to be used by the court in determining the amount of the fine, time schedule for payment and method of payment. The procedures set forth in the proposed new section 414 are derived from the House version of the proposed criminal code. See House Report 96-1396 at 467-8.

Section 11: Amends three sections of title 21 to increase the maximum amount that may be imposed as a criminal fine. This section also authorizes the court to use an alternative means of setting the fine to be imposed.

Section 12: Establishes the effective date for the legislation as October 1, 1982. This date was chosen to avoid problems with the Budget Act.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for the week of January 25, 1982, on account of a death in the family.

² In *United States v. Mandel*, 408 F. Supp. 679 (D. Md. 1976), rev'd on other grounds, 602 F.2d 653 (4th Cir. 1979) (*en banc*) the court required the government to meet requirements similar to those set forth in the proposed amendment. The court in *United States v. Bello*, 470 F. Supp. 723 (S.D. Calif. 1979), reached a contrary result. The *Bello* court granted the requested restraining order despite the fact that it interfered with a defendant's right to freely choose counsel. *United States v. Scalzitti*, 408 F. Supp. 1014 (W.D. Pa. 1975), appeal dismissed, 556 F.2d 569 (3rd Cir. 1977).

³ The Supreme Court in *Calero-Toledo v. Pearson Yacht Leasing Co.*, 416 U.S. 663 (1974), held that a Puerto Rico statute authorizing in rem forfeitures did not require a prior hearing. The novelty of criminal forfeitures, which are in personam in nature, makes the applicability of *Calero* to such statutes unclear. Compare *United States v. Scharf*, 551 F.2d 1124, 1126 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 824 (1979) (*dicta*, court authorizes *ex parte* restraining orders) with *United States v. Mandel*, *supra*.

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for Monday, January 25, 1982, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOWERY of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 30 minutes, January 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GAYDOS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. COELHO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEVITAS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LEVITAS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUGHES, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOWERY of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Mr. DANNEMEYER.
Mr. DORNAN of California in two instances.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. DAUB.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. PARRIS in two instances.
Mr. HYDE.

Mr. EVANS of Delaware.
Mr. DREIER in two instances.
Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. CAMPBELL.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. NOWAK.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. CROCKETT.
Mr. HOYER in two instances.
Mr. McDONALD in five instances.
Ms. FERRARO.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. FITHIAN.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. LEHMAN.
Mr. LaFALCE in three instances.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. HUGHES.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mr. DOWNEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes, under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1982, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report of House committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the third quarter of calendar year 1981 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 is as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1981

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Glenn English	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/7	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		(*)			1,350.90	570.00
Benjamin A. Gilman	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/3	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		757.98			1,350.90	1,117.98
Patrick L. Carpentier	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/7	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		(*)			1,350.90	570.00
Roscoe B. Starek III	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/7	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		(*)			1,350.90	570.00
Elliott A. Brown	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/7	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		(*)			1,350.90	570.00
Irving H. Soloway	6/27	6/30	Italy	290.815	245.00		(*)			290.815	245.00
	6/30	7/7	Germany	1,350.90	570.00		(*)			1,350.90	570.00
Leo C. Zeferetti	8/23	8/30	Peru	270.600	600.00		(*)			270.600	600.00
Patrick L. Carpentier	8/23	8/30	Peru	270.600	600.00		(*)			270.600	600.00
Elliott A. Brown	8/23	8/30	Peru	270.600	600.00		(*)			270.600	600.00
Committee total					6,690.00		757.98				7,237.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military transportation costs were \$29,977.92.

⁴ Military transportation costs were \$8,153.31.

LEO C. ZEFERETTI, Chairman. Oct. 30, 1981.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2895. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the initial allocation of the total civilian authorization among military departments and the defense agencies, together with notice of an

increase over the authorized strength, pursuant to sections 601(b)(1) and (d) of Public Law 97-86; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2896. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on measures to combat waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the defense program, pursuant to section 918 of Public Law 97-86; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2897. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting notice of the waiver of

the minimum funding and staffing requirements for technology transfer from Defense Department laboratories, pursuant to section 11(b) of Public Law 96-480; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2898. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Department of Energy, transmitting the final report on applications study for wind energy systems at Federal facilities, pursuant to section 11(1)(c) of Public Law 96-345; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

2899. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the public debt by authorizing a flexible investment yield on U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2900. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the public debt by eliminating the limitation on the amount of the Treasury bonds issued paying interest in excess of 4 1/4 per centum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 5362. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit the imposition of a surcharge on any service station operator who honors a credit card issued by a gasoline company; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORCORAN:

H.R. 5363. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modify certain administrative procedures in order to expedite proceedings of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 5364. A bill to rescind the tax benefits enacted during 1981 which provided special deductions with respect to the living expenses of Members of Congress and to decrease the amount of outside earned income a Member may accept; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 5365. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to allow Federal employees to take paid leave for duty in the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. FERRARO (for herself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HOYER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 5366. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authorization for Federal agencies to use flexible and compressed employee work schedules; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. FIEDLER:

H.R. 5367. A bill to rename the Sepulveda Veterans' Administration Medical Center located in Sepulveda, Calif., as the "Bob Hope Veterans' Administration Medical Center;" to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 5368. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to exclude burial plots and burial insurance policies from the determination of an SSI applicant's resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5369. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a sum for funeral expenses when certain veterans die and to authorize the appropriation of funds for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1982, for burial benefits for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.R. 5370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the establishment of and the deduction of contributions to education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 5371. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, the Controlled Substances Act, and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act, to improve forfeiture provisions and strengthen penalties for controlled substances offenses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 5372. A bill to suspend until the close of June 30, 1984, the column 1 rate of duty on unmounted gold leaf; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend section 709 of title 32, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that 30 days notice of termination of employment be given to civilian National Guard technicians who serve under temporary appointments or who voluntarily cease to be members of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 5374. A bill to amend section 709 of title 32, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of Defense to approve certain regulations governing excepted service technicians of the National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 5375. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to extend the period of time during which all elements of a National Guard unit must complete a training assembly; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that all persons originally enlisting in a reserve component of the Armed Forces perform an initial period of active duty for training of not less than 12 weeks and to extend from 180 days to 270 days the period within which persons enlisted under such section are required to begin their initial period of active duty for training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 5377. A bill to rescind the special tax benefits enacted during 1981 with respect to the living expenses of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BRODHEAD, and Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5378. A bill to clarify that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not provide tax benefits to organizations which discriminate on the basis of race or color; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. McCLORY):

H.R. 5379. A bill to amend Public Law 97-76 to extend the period during which authorities provided under the Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, fiscal year 1980, are continued in effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 5380. A bill to recognize the organization known as American Ex-Prisoners of War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN of California (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANNUNZIO,

Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAFALLIS, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. CARMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EARLY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HENDON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEBOULLIER, Mr. LEE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOEFELER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. VENTO):

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution designating July 9, 1982 as "National P.O.W.-M.I.A. Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution designating Baltic Freedom Day; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PURSELL:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution urging prompt implementation of proposed class exemptions for transactions involving use of construction industry pension funds for investments in residential mortgages; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with

respect to the situation of two Soviet families, known as the Siberian Seven, who have sought refuge in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow because of the discrimination of their Pentecostal faith by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H. Res. 326. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the second session of the Ninety-seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. CONABLE):

H. Res. 327. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Ways and Means in the second session of the Ninety-seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 5381. A bill for the relief of Jin Hee Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 5382. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Ann Kaufman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 70: Mr. LONG of Maryland.
H.R. 1647: Mr. LUNGREN.
H.R. 1850: Mrs. HECKLER.
H.R. 1918: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. QUILLEN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. EVANS of Georgia.
H.R. 2389: Mr. ASHBROOK.
H.R. 3274: Mr. SMITH of Alabama.
H.R. 3300: Mr. BURGNER, Mr. DECKARD, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. SILJANDER.
H.R. 3575: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3600: Mr. WEBER of Ohio.

H.R. 4467: Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 4510: Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. COATS, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. HILLIS.

H.R. 4708: Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 4931: Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. DECKARD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 4999: Mr. MOTT, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 5004: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DYSON, Mr. CHENEY, and Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota.

H.R. 5088: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FISH, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. MOFFETT.

H.R. 5117: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Ms. FIEDLER.

H.R. 5160: Mr. GRAMM, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. WAMPLER.

H.R. 5176: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DENARDIS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DWYER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. NAPIER, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 5223: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 5242: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. BROTHILL.

H.R. 5284: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 5323: Mr. RAILSBACK.

H.R. 5357: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. EMERY, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. BOUQUARD.

H.J. Res. 365: Mr. FRANK, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. YATRON, Mr. KRAMER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 219: Mr. DENARDIS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECKARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARMAN, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. MARKS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CORRADA, and Mr. MARRIOTT.

H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. SIMON and Mr. DWYER.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 248: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BEARD, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. EMERY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H. Res. 252: Mr. GRAY and Mr. AKAKA.

H. Res. 269: Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LENT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. WOLF, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. BENJAMIN, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

330. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Cambridge, Mass., relative to human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

331. Also, petition of the National Assembly Association of the Republic of China, relative to the sale of advanced aircraft to Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

332. Also, petition of the 1981 annual conference session of United Methodist Youth in the North Carolina Conference, Raleigh, relative to conservation of fossil fuels; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOVIETS REMEMBER FORRESTAL IN ASSESSING U.S. DEFENSE BUILDUP

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, James V. Forrestal was our first Secretary of Defense and perhaps our best, in my view. Then Secretary Forrestal (1947-49) correctly assessed the Soviet threat and wanted to orient our defenses to meet that challenge. In attempting to make his case, he ran into a stone wall of policymakers who were convinced that the Soviets would behave if we just did something additionally nice for them—some who were naive and some who were high in Government and working for the other side, as later events were to reveal. However, swimming against the tide, Forrestal was considered controversial and the strange circumstances of his death did not diminish the controversy. However, if a man is known by his enemies, the Soviets have neither forgotten nor forgiven Forrestal for opposing them.

Mr. Louis M. Hohlmeier, Washington editor of *Financier*, discusses Forrestal in the January 1982 issue of the *Financier*, pointing out that the Soviets recently compared him to Secretary Weinberger, and how they fear a buildup of our defenses. The article follows:

SOVIETS REMEMBER FORRESTAL IN ASSESSING U.S. DEFENSE BUILDUP

(By Louis M. Hohlmeier)

In the year that has passed since Ronald Reagan became President and promised more guns and no less butter, Mr. Reagan has been educated to the enormous difficulty of increasing Defense spending substantially while at the same time reducing taxes significantly and cutting domestic spending only modestly. Now, as he prepares to address Congress on the State of the Union, looming Budget deficits raise large questions concerning the future of tax policy and spending levels, but in the broad domestic area, and not in Defense.

At some unremarked moment within the past few years, the U.S. recovered sufficiently from the military and political trauma of Viet Nam to begin thinking that Defense spending was not necessarily bad, and patriotism was not passe. Defense spending began to rise when Jimmy Carter was President, and the Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress.

Its pace has quickened under Mr. Reagan, with Democrats and Republicans in full agreement in principle on its direction: Up.

Political and popular perceptions of the threat posed by the Soviet Union to the U.S.

are changing—and they involve more than a departure from the anti-military, anti-war movements of the Viet Nam period, however.

To a remarkable extent, the Communist and non-Communist or anti-Communist worlds remain as divided as they were four decades ago by the events of World War II and the Cold War.

But new tensions are growing in those old divisions, and U.S. perceptions of the Soviet threat may well be subject to change more radical than any since the end of World War II.

A funny thing happened in Moscow several months ago when the Department of Defense in Washington released its new and widely publicized study titled *Soviet Military Power*.

It described the Soviet military buildup in some detail, with full-color pictures of Russian missiles, tanks, ships and planes. "For the past quarter century," Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger said in a preface, "we have witnessed the continuing growth of Soviet military power at a pace that shows no signs of slackening in the future. . . . The greatest defense forces in the world are those of free people in free nations well informed as to the challenge they face, firmly united in their resolve to provide fully for the common defense, thereby deterring aggression and safeguarding the security of the world's democracies."

Pravda called the study a "routine fabrication;" that reaction was hardly surprising. The obvious intent of the study was to promote popular and political support in the U.S. and abroad for the Reagan Administration's buildup of U.S. military power.

The next day, however, Pravda launched into a strong attack on Mr. Weinberger. It called his study an "outpouring of irresponsible claptrap," and accused him of "propagandistic hysteria." It compared him with James V. Forrestal, who, Pravda said, "is known to have come to a bad end" because of his "anti-Soviet hallucinations."

REVELATION OF FEAR

That was a remarkable comparison for the Russians to draw, not necessarily because it is inaccurate but because it is one that few Americans have drawn. Mr. Forrestal is all but forgotten in the U.S.—but obviously is well remembered in the Soviet Union, or at least in the Kremlin. The comparison drawn by Pravda unintentionally illustrates the grave Soviet fear of a U.S. military buildup.

If Americans have forgotten, Soviet military leaders well remember that Mr. Forrestal, previously an investment banker on Wall Street, became the most articulate spokesman within the Roosevelt and Truman Cabinets of the viewpoint that the Soviet Union was bent on world aggression that could not be stopped except with U.S. military power.

He was President Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy, and became the nation's first Secretary of Defense under President Harry S. Truman, but his viewpoint was not popular, and it did not prevail.

He was an anti-Communist even when the U.S. was allied with the Soviet Union in the war against Germany—a time when the pop-

ular wish was to believe in the peaceful postwar intentions of the Russians.

When the war was over, public opinion in America demanded immediate demobilization, and Mr. Truman, inexperienced in the ways of war or peace, tried mightily to accommodate that demand. Military spending was reduced so quickly and drastically that he was able to balance the Federal Budget in 1947, 1948, and 1949.

After the 1948 election, Mr. Truman dismissed Mr. Forrestal for political rather than military reasons, and Mr. Forrestal shortly thereafter took his own life, apparently blaming himself for having failed to convince his President of the magnitude of the threat of Soviet military power.

Mr. Forrestal was one of the larger enigmas of U.S. history. He could not be explained by the Democratic Presidents who employed him and promoted him, so he was more or less forgotten. But he apparently is still remembered well in the Soviet Union.

Pravda's comparison of Mr. Forrestal to Mr. Weinberger is of course inaccurate and misleading. Mr. Forrestal was an intense and unquestionably brilliant man who lived at a time when the U.S. was embroiled in its own fierce and emotional debate over the intentions of the Soviet Union and the meanings of Communism.

IN VITAL RESPECTS, THE SAME

Mr. Weinberger, on the other hand, may be no less brilliant, but he also is no fatalist. His world is very different from that of Mr. Forrestal, yet time may prove the comparison drawn by Pravda to be not entirely inaccurate. The world has changed, but in vital respects it has remained remarkably the same.

But change may well be at hand, in part because Mr. Reagan is President and Mr. Weinberger is Secretary of Defense, and in part because it is developing new and fearsome tensions within and without the orbit of Soviet military power.

If history is prologue, the awful strains inside Communist Poland are portentous. Germany cannot forever remain divided between East and West. Those old tensions left behind in Eastern Europe and the Far East by World War II and the Cold War are made more ominous by new ones the Soviet Union has created by its aggressions in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

With the benefit of 40 years of hindsight, one can conclude without great difficulty that U.S. foreign and military policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union have been, in the Washington vernacular, a mess.

To make that charge is to imply that the Democrats and liberal Republicans who served as Presidents, until Mr. Reagan's election, were responsible for it. But that implication is without foundation.

CONSERVATIVES SHARE BLAME

The conservative Republicans, for example, during Mr. Truman's time, were demanding instant demobilization and a balanced Budget even as they were condemning Godless Russian Communism.

Such are the paradoxical inefficiencies of politics in a popular democracy, as compared with the political efficiency of totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, however, history is prologue. The postwar history of Soviet-U.S. relations normally is dated from that time in 1947 when Mr. Truman finally decided the Russians were not to be trusted, and enunciated the Truman Doctrine for containment of Communism in Greece and Turkey. But by then the Russians controlled all of Eastern Europe, including Poland.

The containment policy was meaningless to Eastern Europe, and the military posture of the U.S. was such that the Soviet Union could have crushed the American policy in Greece and Turkey also.

Mr. Truman, shortly after he was unexpectedly and unwillingly thrust into the Presidency upon the death of Mr. Roosevelt, declared that "Peace is hell." He tried to pursue his predecessor's policies without knowing precisely what those policies were—if indeed Mr. Roosevelt himself had known what his postwar policies might have been.

POWER LOW, BUDGET BALANCED

He watched helplessly while China fell to Communism. When finally, for the first time since World War II, he decided that Communism had to be contained with American military power, U.S. military strength was at its lowest ebb in several years—during which time, however, he had balanced the Budget.

But Mr. Truman went into Korea expecting the containment of Communism to require no more than a police action, unworthy of a declaration of war.

When the Korean and Chinese Communists proved otherwise, there followed an acrimonious debate between Mr. Truman and General Douglas MacArthur over American foreign and military policy; the result was a stalemate arranged by President Dwight Eisenhower after Mr. Truman's unpopularity cost the Democrats control of the White House and Congress.

If Korea was a stalemate, as an exercise in Communist containment, Viet Nam was a military and political disaster—an American tragedy appreciated by the Kremlin in many ways.

The anti-war, anti-military movement that shook the country were led by young radicals, but Viet Nam's legacy swept the whole nation and profoundly affected foreign and military policy. Defense spending fell sharply after President Lyndon Johnson was ridden from office, and Richard Nixon became President. By 1975, the Defense budget, measured in constant dollars, was no more than it had been in 1955.

NEVER QUITE DECIDED

In sum, the only consistency in U.S. policy for four decades has been inconsistency and improvisation. Ever since the Soviet Union emerged from World War II as the only world power rivaling the U.S. the U.S. has never quite decided what to make of it.

The improvisations of Mr. Truman and his successor Presidents obviously were not complete failures. Greece and Turkey did not fall to Communism, although that happy result seems to have flowed less from U.S. military conviction than from the fact that Stalin's Russia was not at that time prepared militarily to extend its Eastern European conquests so far South.

The Berlin airlift preserved a U.S. presence in Germany's ancient capital when the Russians blockaded the highway, rail, and water routes to Berlin. But again, the Berlin airlift was a defensive kind of improvisation that succeeded only because the Russians did not try to blockade its particular access to the city.

In larger sum, the U.S. in the decades since World War II has concentrated on butter except on those occasions when it reluctantly and momentarily concentrated on guns.

Twice since then the U.S. has gone to war against Communist forces, but carefully has avoided war with the Soviet Union itself; and obviously during the Korean and Viet Nam Wars the U.S. did rearm itself. But except for those episodes, the long-term trend line for U.S. military preparedness since World War II has been down.

From 1955 to 1965, outlays for Defense declined from about 10% to about 7% of GNP. After Viet Nam, they fell sharply, and remained in the vicinity of 5% of GNP through almost all the 1970s.

In that same quarter-century, the Soviet Union has increased spending on what it euphemistically also calls Defense—an average 12% to 14% of their GNP.

Defense spending as a percentage of GNP is not a precise measure of any nation's ability to fight and win a war, conventional or nuclear; but it is one measure worthy of attention unless or until Russian and U.S. combat capabilities are tested against each other.

UNITED STATES LOSING LEAD

The Defense Department does not concede military superiority to the Russians. But it asserts that the U.S.S.R. in the last quarter-century has "dramatically reduced the U.S. lead in virtually every important basic technology," and that the U.S. is actually losing its lead in key sectors.

The next question, of course, concerns what the Soviet Union intends to do with its military power, and indeed what the Russians have done in the past five years and still are doing.

In its own use of military force, the U.S.S.R. historically has been respectful of U.S. military power. The possibility of war with the U.S. surely was one consideration in the Soviet decision not to challenge militarily the Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey, and not to shoot down American aircraft in the Berlin airlift.

Clearly, though, the Soviet Union did use military force to subjugate Eastern European nations because it was quite convinced that the U.S. would not intervene militarily there.

Of course, those military decisions were made by the Kremlin at a time when the U.S. possessed and the Soviet Union did not possess the atomic bomb.

Subsequently the Russians exploded their atomic bomb, and they now have acquired a nuclear arsenal, but they still have not started what in the Kremlin might be called a preventive war. The Kremlin has been and surely is anxious to avoid the debilitating costs of nuclear war.

POLITICAL GAINS WITHOUT WAR

It adds to its arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons in the belief that, as it gains military strength looking toward military superiority, its political objectives will be served without resort to war with the United States.

The Soviet military buildup has facilitated not only the strengthening of Warsaw Pact forces in Eastern Europe, but has also enabled the Russians to send arms and military advisers to Algeria, Libya, Angola, Ethiopia, Iraq, Syria, and South Yemen. Military aid has made surrogates of East Germany, North Korea, and most spectacularly Cuba.

Those are some of the manifestations of Soviet military power that 12% to 14% of

Soviet GNP has bought in the past quarter-century, and those are some of the manifestations of Soviet power that prompted the Democrats, when they controlled the White House and Congress, to begin spending more on Defense very late in the '70s.

In the last year he was President, Mr. Carter proposed for fiscal 1981 an increase of almost 7% in Defense spending; only four years earlier in the U.S. and its NATO allies had agreed on a 3% growth target.

Those manifestations of Soviet power that spread from Cuba to Mozambique to North Korea may not represent the most serious threats to world peace, however.

For the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies in Europe have created profound difficulties for themselves and potentially for the U.S. by spending great sums on guns and relatively small sums on butter. They have sustained high levels of military expenditures at the cost of deteriorating economies over the past decade.

In so allocating their resources, the Communist nations have invited domestic troubles in the form of food shortages, low labor productivity, transportation snarls, and energy constraints.

NO LESS ON GUNS

But the totalitarian Governments of those countries quite apparently have no intention whatsoever of spending less on guns and more on butter. The workers of Poland and possibly other countries may rebel, and their rebellions will be put down with that same Communist military strength that was created to spread the blessings of Communism worldwide.

Russian-style Communism proved no blessing to China, and disaffection from Communism could spread from Poland to other countries of Eastern Europe. The Soviet's willingness to use its military power on a large scale to protect its political interests was demonstrated in a significant way in Afghanistan two years ago.

The conclusion that faces the Reagan Administration then is that Soviet military power may well represent a threat to world peace not merely in Afghanistan, Cuba, and other places that, in the world scheme, are relatively small and relatively insignificant, but also in the larger and more strategic places of Europe and the Far East.

After four decades, improvisation in U.S. foreign and military policy seems no longer adequate, if it ever was.

NO CHANCE COMPARISON

It may be by chance that Mr. Reagan is the first genuinely conservative Republican who has sat in the White House since Herbert Hoover, but it is not by chance that he has moved toward the substantially larger Defense budgets that were proposed by Mr. Carter. Nor is it by chance that the Kremlin sees a comparison between Defense Secretaries Weinberger and Forrester.

The U.S. it appears, is entering upon a time when Communist containment will be redefined, and U.S. military power will bear some relationship to the new definition.

Military spending will continue to grow, barring a highly unlikely retreat by the Soviets from their own spending habits of the past quarter-century, and the U.S. will be required to devote more of its GNP to guns, and less to butter.

And the education of Mr. Reagan relative to domestic spending and taxes will continue.

But the future of U.S. relations with the Soviet Union might draw hope from the past. Winston Churchill in his Iron Curtain

speech at Fulton, Missouri, nearly four decades ago, said that there is nothing the Soviet Union respects more than military strength, and nothing it respects less than military weakness.●

PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM WORKING

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress reacts to President Reagan's state of the Union address, I would urge my colleagues to keep one primary consideration in mind: the President's program for economic recovery is working. It was never intended to provide an instantaneous cure for our fiscal ills. We have a great deal of work to do if that program is to succeed.

During the first session of this Congress, we took major steps toward restoring fiscal stability. We trimmed some of the excess expenditures from the Federal budget and passed the largest tax cut in the history of this country.

Today, however, we must face the issue of whether the 97th Congress will be remembered for its courage and commitment in completing the important work it began or whether it will be thought of as a Congress that had a promising beginning, but failed to finish the job.

We have only begun the fight to turn our economy around. This is not the time to quit.

The tax cuts, which were implemented in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, must continue to take effect as scheduled. As taxes are reduced, the economy will be considerably strengthened during the years ahead. The reduction in taxes has already resulted in increased savings by Americans. If we continue along this path, we can also expect to see a substantial decrease in unemployment as incentives for risk taking and job creation begin to take hold.

We must continue to slow the growth of Federal spending. There is still much fraud and abuse in our Government which has to be eliminated. It is imperative that we not retreat from the course of cutting Federal programs which have proven records of ineffectiveness and waste while simultaneously maintaining benefits for the truly needy.

To remove the fraud and abuse from our Government and make it better able to serve the people, the President has proposed a dramatic restructuring of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States. By 1991, State and local governments will administer more than 40 programs

which are now administered by the Federal Government. The States will definitely be able to administer these programs with more compassion and cost-effectiveness than any Washington bureaucrat ever has done.

After all that we have accomplished, it would be tragic, indeed, if this Congress were to back away from completing this crucial task. Clearly, the programs of the past have not worked, but the programs of the future will work if we give them a chance.●

NATURAL GAS PRICES

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress returns to resume consideration of the many weighty matters on its agenda for the second session, the Reagan administration has stated that it will soon submit to the Congress a proposal to accelerate the decontrol of natural gas prices. While there are many serious questions which must be resolved before any decision is reached on this matter, one of the most important is the effect which early decontrol will have upon those who produce the food for this Nation and for much of the rest of the world. A recent editorial published in the Fremont, Nebr., Tribune cites the cost of accelerated decontrol to America's farmers. Dependent as farmers are upon anhydrous ammonia fertilizer, the cost of which, in turn, is heavily dependent upon that of natural gas, early decontrol will have a devastating impact upon the farmer's ability to make a profit. In these times of economic distress on the farm, it is imperative that this issue be addressed before the Congress acts on these proposals, and I urge my colleagues to read the following article which further reflects on this issue:

[From the Fremont (Nebr.) Tribune, Dec. 15, 1981]

ACCELERATED GAS DECONTROL OPPOSED

Farmers, already beleaguered by record low grain prices and record high production costs, now face another congressional measure that would strain even further the delicate agriculture economy.

Congress now is considering an accelerated natural gas price decontrol plan that would increase farm production costs and take an enormous bite out of farm income. The proposal, if approved, eventually would affect consumers as well and should be vigorously opposed.

The accelerated decontrol plan is supported by wellhead producers of natural gas and is opposed by natural gas distributors and suppliers.

A study done by the Citizen-Labor Energy Coalition shows that accelerated decontrol would increase production costs for farmers by \$8.2 billion in the next three years. Ne-

braska farmers alone would absorb \$417 million in increased costs, the study says.

Most of the additional costs would come in the form of anhydrous ammonia fertilizers. Presently, nitrogen fertilizer costs about \$250 a ton, but the study says accelerated decontrol would push it to \$620 a ton by 1984, adding more than 26 cents to the cost of producing a bushel of corn. Additional price factors would be residential energy, production of electricity, irrigation and propane expenses.

If Congress and the Reagan administration are intent on satisfying wellhead producers by accelerating natural gas decontrol, a closer examination of its effect on farmers and subsequent food costs is called for. Decontrol might be the ticket to ensure an adequate supply of natural gas but it must not be at the expense of farmers.

Its effect goes far beyond the fields, silos and elevators of Nebraska. The proportion of income Americans spend on food still is one of the lowest in the world. But the more economic pressures put on farmers to increase production while returns decrease, the more expensive food will become.

Corn prices have the biggest effect on the price of meat, especially red meats like beef. And beef today is getting so expensive Americans are forsaking it for alternatives like fish, pork and fowl. Cattle and cattlemen are becoming an endangered species, and accelerated gas decontrol would be another nail in their coffin.

By protecting the economy of the farmers, Americans are protecting their own personal economy.

Maybe citizens won't yell loud enough until they are forced to pay \$10 a pound for hamburger and \$5 for a dozen eggs. But by then it may be too late.●

CLEMSON TIGERS ARE NO. 1

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, this week representatives of the Clemson Tigers, the No. 1 college football team in the Nation, are visiting Washington. As a South Carolinian, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome these outstanding men and recognize their accomplishments.

Coming off a six and five season last year, the Tigers showed a determination and dedication this season that is truly noteworthy. They ended the 1981 season as the only undefeated team from a major school. During the season, they defeated three teams ranked in the top 10 and produced three All-Americans. Head Coach Danny Ford, at the age of 33, was the youngest coach-of-the-year ever chosen. And, on New Year's Day, the Clemson Tigers defeated a fine team from Nebraska to become the No. 1 team in the Nation.

We in South Carolina are justifiably proud of Clemson University and the fine young people it produces. In fact, this week has been proclaimed "Clemson is No. 1" week in our State by the

Governor. However, Clemson's recognition is not limited to South Carolina. The highlight of their representatives' visit this week will be a meeting with a former sportscaster from Des Moines, Iowa, who has done pretty well for himself also. It won't be the first time a football player has been to the White House, but I'm very sure they have never had such an influx of tiger paws before.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday thousands of patriotic Ukrainian Americans celebrated their independence day. I was privileged to speak to one of these moving ceremonies at Parma, Ohio and share with these fine patriots some of my views. Solidarity has a new meaning. The Polish workers reminded us that the free world, indeed their Eastern European brothers and sisters, were silent when the Baltic States were ruthlessly annexed over 40 years ago. The Hungarian freedom fighters fought alone in 1956, the Czechoslovakian patriots in 1968 and now we realize what many of us have said all along—the loss of freedom anywhere is the loss of freedom to all of us.

The Ukrainian people in particular have been victims of brutal Nazi and Communist repression. The Communists slaughtered some 11,000 Ukrainians at Vinnista at the same time their Polish brothers were being massacred at Katyn Forest in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the anniversary celebrated by the Ukrainians in the free world each January has a meaningful significance not only for the Ukrainians but for the people of the United States and the whole free world as well. It is obvious that when freedom is obliterated in one country, it indirectly affects all the other free peoples. At a time when Moscow tries to impress the world as the champion of anticolonialism, there is an urgent need to remind our people of the fate of nations forced to live under the brutal oppression of Communist dictatorship.

Ukraine with a population of over 50 million was the first victim of Soviet Russian aggression. It is the largest non-Russian Nation within the Soviet Russian Empire. This entitles her to rank in Europe next to Russia, Germany, and France not only in terms of population, but also in terms of strategic geographic position and rich resources. Because of her resources, it had always been regarded as a coveted prize of aggressors—first the Mongols,

then Moscovite Tsars and finally the Russian Communists.

When, in 1917, the Russian autocratic government disintegrated, the Ukrainian people availed themselves of the opportunity to regain their own independence. A national government was formed which then issued decrees and promulgated laws, securing liberty and equality for all citizens of Ukraine. At the same time, the Russian Communist Party issued its declaration in favor of the right to self-determination. It soon became apparent, however, that this Soviet declaration was only a clever Bolshevik maneuver to preserve the unity of the former Russian Empire. Simultaneously with the ostentatious proclamation of the right to self-rule, the Soviet Russian Government dispatched to the Ukrainian National Government a 48-hour ultimatum dated December 17, 1917, signed by Lenin and Stalin, demanding unconditional surrender and the acceptance of Soviet Russian domination over Ukraine. The reply by the Ukrainian Government of December 19, 1917, is regarded today as a historical and a classic document which clearly exhibits a unique comprehension of the potential Communist threat not only to the young Ukrainian Republic, but to the free peoples throughout the world. Ukrainians realized already in 1917 that between the czarist and the Bolshevik imperialism, there was little or no difference. Rejecting the Soviet ultimatum, Ukraine proclaimed her independence on January 22, 1918. The proclamation of the reunification of all Ukrainian territories in one single democratic state followed a year later on January 22, 1919. With these two significant acts, the Ukrainians demonstrated to the world that Moscow and Kiev represented two different nations, and two different mentalities. Kiev personified the democratic concept of government based on respect for human rights and the dignity of man, while Moscow represented not only totalitarianism but also a godless force of destruction.

The ensuing Russian-Ukrainian war of almost 4 years' duration (1917-21) is rather obscured, because at that time communism was not recognized as a danger to the free world. The Russian Communists were aided in their war against Ukrainians by a majority of the Russians who sacrificed democracy in order to preserve the unity of the Russian Empire.

Since the Bolshevik Russian occupation of Ukraine, more than 10 million Ukrainians died in the defense of their independence. Ukraine would have remained free had the Western nations paid heed to her warnings of the potential Communist menace and answered her desperate call for moral and military assistance. Without Ukraine's strategic position and her

immeasurable mineral resources the Soviet Russian Government would have difficulties in initiating aggressive pressures toward the West. We, Americans, should find comfort in knowing that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not all Russia, but a group of captive nations yearning for an opportunity to break this chain of bondage and become masters of their destinies within their respective Republics. During and after World War II, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), reaffirming the will of Ukrainian people to sovereignty, was actively engaged in fighting nazism and communism alike. Paradoxically, the Western Powers again were not interested in the emergence of this freedom force in Eastern Europe, and unwittingly helped the Kremlin pave its way to the heart of Europe and Asia. On the basis of our experience with the Communists, we should know by now that the only policy capable of shaking the foundations of the Soviet Russian slave empire is a policy motivated by the idea of individual and national liberty for all. It is this ideological weapon the Communists fear most. For this reason, the Ukrainians would wholeheartedly support the U.S. ideological reorientation which would include an open support for Ukraine's as well as for other nations' rights to liberty and independence. Such a policy would force the Kremlin into a defensive position and may prove to be the best deterrent to a global war.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the House's attention the 64th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. It is indeed fitting that the Congress should pay tribute to the aspirations and hope for freedom of the Ukrainian people.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic proclaimed its independence from foreign power, and its existence as a free and democratic state. While the Ukraine was soon thereafter crushed by the Soviet Red Army, the proclamation was then, as it is now, a symbol of the Ukrainian nation's courage and commitment to freedom.

As a free country, the United States must continue to show it is not indifferent to the cause of freedom in other countries. We must not forget those in nations held captive by the U.S.S.R., whose cultural, religious, and political rights are systematically denied. Recently, our attention has been centered on another captive

nation, Poland. Like Poland, the Ukraine has continually struggled under the yoke of her Russian neighbor. Martial law in Poland makes us all the more aware of the cruel repression practiced by the Soviets in the captive Eastern European countries, and makes Ukrainian Independence Day all the more significant, not just to Americans of Ukrainian origins, but to all Americans who treasure their freedom and who respect the desire for freedom of others.

As the new year commences, we must all renew our pledge to support the cause of freedom in the Ukraine and throughout the world. ●

HIGH INTEREST IS NO INFLATION SOLUTION

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, last night the President expressed concern for the plight of lumberjacks in the Northwest and then reaffirmed his strong support for continuing a policy of high-interest rates. That is the very policy that has caused the lumberjack's problems.

But it is not just the loggers who are hurting. From loggers to sawmills to lumberyards to homebuilders to real estate, the high-interest-rate policy is a killer. The unemployment rates tell a tragic tale for States like Washington and Oregon which have a major wood products base to their economies.

But the effects of this policy do not even stop there. Auto dealers, farmers, thrift institutions—virtually all small businesses are facing serious problems which end all too often with bankruptcy.

It is a devastating policy.

And that view was reinforced recently in an interview by U.S. News & World Report. It was an unlikely source of criticism of the administration. The President, it was said, "should pressure the Federal Reserve to bring interest rates down. High rates will not solve our inflation problem."

The source of that advice was the administration's economic guru, Dr. Arthur Laffer, exponent of supply-side economics and a member of the Economic Policy Advisory Board for the President.

Still, the policy goes on.

The determination to continue the awful policy was announced a few days ago by the Fed Chairman Volker. The President reaffirmed his enthusiastic support of that policy last night. The meaning can only be that small business is considered expendable in the fight against inflation.

That is so shortsighted.

We do not have to resort to a profligate policy of wildly printing money to correct things. We do not need to swing from the present extreme to that extreme which the defenders of high interest rates always haul out as the strawman in this debate.

Small business needs some wiggle room—some relaxation of interest rates—in order to survive this period of economic difficulty. It continues to be one of the great mysteries of our time why that prudent relief cannot be given to those millions of businesses that are fighting a losing battle of survival under the present rigid and inflexible policy. ●

GET US OUT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that an editorial contains so much information of substance on one subject. However, several dozen copies of one editorial have been sent to me from the Rolla Daily News of Rolla, Mo. The subject is the United Nations, and the editorial writer is Edward W. Sowers. Mr. Sowers demonstrates clearly the growing disillusionment, as well as outright condemnation, by the American public of the United Nations.

Mr. Sowers cites an excellent secondary source for information; namely, Robert W. Lee's "The United Nations Conspiracy." I recommend this book highly to my colleagues. Mr. Sowers calls attention to the fact of only two Senators voting against acceptance of the original United Nations Charter. Sad as it is to observe, this absolute minority was right. Maybe my colleagues will now pay heed and realize that, as Mr. Sowers suggests, and I wholeheartedly concur, it is high time to: "Get US Out!" Mr. Sowers editorial of December 31, 1981, follows:

[From the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News, Dec. 13, 1981]

UNITED NATIONS CONSPIRACY

(By Edward W. Sowers)

The United Nations, for three and one-half decades, has been indulging in a gigantic and unfettered conspiracy—mostly at U.S. taxpayers' expense—to enslave our free republic in a world government dominated by the Communistic Soviet Union, and its pip-squeak surrogates generally referred to as the Third World.

Having had enough of this free-wheeling conspiracy, more and more responsible officials and thinking citizens are ready for us to pull out.

A few years ago this opinion, which I share with the others, would have been regarded as unthinkable, something like condemning apple pie and motherhood. Not so today. In 1959, the Gallup Poll reported

that 87 percent of the American people thought that the U.N. was doing a good job. But, on Nov. 19, 1980, a Gallup Poll reported that only 31 percent thought the United Nations was doing the job it set out to do at its inception in 1945.

What has happened to force this change. Well, time after time, the United Nations has taken pro-Soviet Communistic actions, helping only Russia and its surrogates to the detriment of the U.S. and its allies. These actions and their results are emerging from behind the cloaks of U.N. propaganda, getting into books (notably Robert W. Lee's "The United Nations Conspiracy") and is now up for official consideration in a bill before Congress.

Yes, Congressman Larry McDonald (D-Georgia) has introduced a bill, (H.R. 3861), which would "terminate all participation by the United States in the United Nations, and to remove all privileges, exemptions and immunities of the United Nations."

U.S. Senator Robert Packwood (R-Oregon) thinks "The United Nations does not take itself seriously as a body designed to try to keep world peace, let alone world morality, and I think the time has come: Does this nation any longer belong in that body?"

Meanwhile, Sen. William L. Langer (R-North Dakota) told his colleagues as early as July 28, 1945, before he was one of two senators voting against accepting the United Nations charter (treaty) that he believed the charter is fraught with danger to the American people.

Then why did the other senators overwhelmingly adopt the charter. Well, for one thing senators made up their minds before reading the charter put together by Alger Hiss, Communist, in San Francisco. World War II was just over, the senators reasoned, and the world has to bind itself united for peace. But the senators, it has turned out, made a colossal mistake, as Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Arizona) now admits:

"... The time has come to recognize the United Nations for the anti-American, anti-freedom organization that it has become. The time has come for us to cut off all financial help, withdraw as a member, and ask the United Nations to find a headquarters that is more in keeping with the philosophy of the majority of voting members, someplace like Moscow or Peking."

Why has a man of Goldwater's knowledge and experience reached that conclusion. Well, he has observed it from his vantage point in the Senate, as the U.N. record unfolded. He saw, as even I did in Rhodesia, how the U.N. voted an embargo against that strong ally and friend of the U.S. in South Africa. How Great Britain followed suit, with the result of the solid white government led by Ian Smith fell, helped along by U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and U.N. Representative Andrew Young, and is now in the hands of Soviet Communists, who have renamed it Zimbabwe. At the head is a guerrilla named Mugabe, chief of his fellow guerrillas who shot and killed with Soviet-designed AK-47 assault rifles.

This and literally dozens of other pro-Communist accomplishments of the U.N. I've read and underlined in Author Lee's book "The United Nations Conspiracy." The case with Rhodesia I experienced first-hand with a trip there in 1974, but Lee's book documents other U.N. "achievements" happening since. And they are still happening since the book went to press. In this week's Wall Street Journal, a reporter from the Journal writing from Southwest Africa states the

U.N. is about to force the Southwest African government out from under the protective wing of South Africa and into the hands of Marxist guerrillas.

When one looks back at the leaders of the U.N. why shouldn't it take pro-communist action, Alger Hiss, chief architect of the charter, notorious Communist, Trygve Lie, second Secretary General, a Norwegian Socialist whose country was subject to Soviet reprisals and thus influenced by Soviet extortion; Dag Hammarskjöld, a Swedish one-worlder, backed by the Soviet, who once said, "I have a strong feeling that I am a new Jesus." The next one, U Thant, a Burmese Marxist, strongly supported by the Soviet again and again for re-election. U Thant, after concluding the U.N.'s bloody war against black-ruled, anti-Communist Katanga, he turned his attention to the white-rule, anti-Communist regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. The U.N. gave \$10,000,000 of UNICEF Halloween funds to fight its unholy war on the Congo. Under Thant's leadership, Rhodesia became (on Dec. 16, 1966) the target of the first economic sanctions ever voted by the United Nations. He later resisted the economic boycott of Communist Cuba. Later, he called for the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam and led the U.S. commanders to give up the "no win" war, leading General Clark to observe this is the first time in the history of the U.S. to sign an armistice without victory.—But it was another victory for the U.N. The next one, Kurt Waldheim, once goosestepped with Hitler's legions. With a swastika on his collar, he accommodated Austria's neighbor, Czechoslovakia, as it was taken over by the Soviet Communists. In more recent years, he followed U Thant's approval of the slaughter by Chairman Mao of millions in old China, then helped expel Taiwan (New China), and take in Communist China.

Thus far, as I have pointed out, the United Nations has been headed by a Soviet spy, two self-proclaimed Socialists, a Burmese Marxist and a former Nazi foot soldier—each Secretary-General to date has been an aggressive enemy of limited government and free enterprise economics. What else could come from the U.N. than pro-Communist actions and moves toward One-World Government. That I don't want. Do you? They take up the slogan, "Get US Out!"

DON ALGIE—OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to George Donald Algie who was honored as the outstanding citizen by the North Torrance (Calif.) Lions Club last Sunday. I heartily concur in the Lions Club's selection, for Don Algie is one of those persons who, without seeking recognition or notoriety, are the strong basis for a good community.

Born in Moline, Ill., in 1917, Donald and his family moved to Eaglerock, Calif., in 1920. After graduating from

Eaglerock High School, he attended Glendale College. In 1947, Don became owner and publisher of the Gardena Valley News, a community newspaper with a history of more than 77 years of quality journalism. Largely under Don's leadership, the News has grown to be one of the finest community newspapers in the country. Don has held his position as owner-publisher ever since.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that dissatisfaction is all too common these days—dissatisfaction with one's job, one's family, one's life. People are changing jobs, and sometimes even occupations, much more often than people used to; people are moving from city to city; the divorce statistics, of course, are very high. I am always pleased, therefore, to see a man such as Don, who has held the same position for 35 years, has a beautiful family, and a happy, content place in his community.

Don's other interests include participation in the Gardena Kiwanis Club, the Gardena Elks Lodge, the Masonic Order, and the YMCA. At the latter, he has served as a judo instructor.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing only the best in the coming years to Don, his wife Sheila, and their two sons, Steve and Dennis.●

TRIBUTE TO ROOSEVELT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no other town in our Nation epitomizes more the era of Franklin Roosevelt than the quaint but distinguished borough of Roosevelt, N.J. This town was initiated in the thirties by a group of garment workers who dreamed of a rural community to be created around a garment factory. Lending a sympathetic ear to the workers' proposals, the entire community was duly built by the Resettlement Administration using WPA labor. As a cooperative, the project later failed; but as a viable living community, the town of Roosevelt has been eminently successful.

The town of Roosevelt was the first, and perhaps the only such borough to be named for the late President Roosevelt. In the small borough park lies the only public monument to the President in the United States—a bronze head standing 6 feet in height mounted on a square marble column. It was executed by the sculptor Johnathan Shahn and cast by the Nicci brothers, the oldest bronze foundry in the world.

The painter Ben Shahn, being employed in the Resettlement Administration, was commissioned to execute a

50-foot-long fresco mural painting in the community building of the town. In this work he traced the history of the garment workers from their grim lives in the old countries through hardships as early immigrants, and on through their gradual rise toward security and well-being as an American labor force. This painting, which has been reproduced in art publications around the world, ends with the resettlement of the garment workers in the new community.

In early years, Roosevelt was much written about as one of the early examples of contemporary architecture integrated into an entire town plan. Because this small borough has been attractive to artists of various kinds, it is now the home of a dozen or so professional artists, several illustrators and composers, a notable opera singer, a playwright, several poets, a few college professors, and other professional people. The most unique and cherished part of this town, however, is its still substantial population of average working people, still dedicated to the American tradition of hard work and fair labor practices.

I want to urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with the proud people of Roosevelt and all of New Jersey in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt on January 30, 1982. As we work to remedy the problems of unemployment and inflation which now limit the growth of our Nation, let us remember the dedication of President Roosevelt just before he died in 1945. In preparing a speech he was to have made, the President wrote: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow is our doubts of today."

As we strive for a freer, stronger America in the years ahead, we should also remember those who are even now struggling for their most basic freedoms—freedoms which Americans fought and died for so many years ago. In particular, we should keep in mind the proud people of Poland, and what their courageous actions have meant for people all around the world. Let us pledge to work together—in solidarity—to protect the freedom we cherish in our homes, our workplaces, and in the world. I thank my colleagues for their consideration.●

FIGHTING CRIME: A NATIONAL PRIORITY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington

report for Wednesday, January 27, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIGHTING CRIME: A NATIONAL PRIORITY

Whether I am reading over the day's correspondence or answering questions at a public meeting, I am certain to see or hear expressions of concern about crime. In repeated questionnaires I have distributed in southern Indiana, fighting crime has been cited consistently as a top priority among Hoosiers.

Reports issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) showed that crime increased 9 percent between 1979 and 1980; violent crime increased 13 percent during the same period. This was the most significant increase in the crime index since 1975, yet these figures are based on official statistics which measure only crimes reported to the police, not unreported crimes. There is some indication that crime has increased much more dramatically than the figures indicate. A nationwide survey found that 54 percent of Americans reported that there was more crime in their neighborhoods in 1980 than during the previous year. Furthermore, the members of one in four American households experienced a physical assault or theft of property in 1980. It is hardly surprising that Hoosiers so often talk to me about crime.

Shortly after taking office last year, the Reagan Administration announced its strong commitment to ensure the domestic security of our citizens and its intention to launch a war on crime. The Attorney General selected a Task Force on Violent Crime to review the problem and make recommendations on ways the federal government could help control the crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault while it maintained its efforts against organized and white-collar crime. However, I am concerned that no new initiatives against crime appear to be forthcoming.

Following the issuance of the final report of the Task Force, President Reagan delivered a major speech on crime in which he endorsed many of its recommendations. He called for legal reforms to ensure the certainty of punishment, but he made no additional effort to assist state and local authorities in apprehending and jailing violent offenders. Instead, the President requested significant reductions in 1982 for the major law enforcement agencies of the federal government—the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), the Bureau of Prisons, and the Coast Guard. These cuts would be in addition to those made in his budget request of March 1981.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The President proposed to cut the FBI by 6 percent, a cut which would result in the loss of as many as 1,000 positions. Such a reduction would prevent the FBI from undertaking any new operations against organized and white-collar crime. For example, nothing more could be done to halt the spread of the violent motorcycle gangs in the West which finance their activities chiefly through illegal traffic in drugs. Important FBI services to state and local lawmen—such as training, laboratory examination, and fingerprint identification—would be reduced.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

In his speech on crime, the President stated his belief that "one of the single most important steps that can lead to a significant reduction in crime is an effective attack on drug traffic." However, he requested that the DEA be cut by 12 percent

in 1982. This reduction would result in the dismissal of 434 employees, half of whom would be agents, and it would lower from 208 to 94 the number of special agents assigned to the state and local task forces which investigate major drug dealers. In addition, the DEA might be compelled to curtail training programs for state and local office and eliminate programs to prevent drug abuse.

BUREAU OF PRISONS

President Reagan proposed an additional 6 percent cut in the federal prison system at a time when the population of inmates is growing, not declining. Federal prisons are 10 percent over capacity at present. Mr. Reagan ignored the recommendation of the Task Force—\$2 billion in federal funds to assist construction in state prison systems, which are approximately 30 percent over capacity. It is not possible to take dangerous offenders off the street and keep them locked up when prisons are already strained to the breaking point.

COAST GUARD

The President requested that the Coast Guard be cut by an additional 4.6 percent despite the fact that the service has a major role in intercepting drugs and enforcing laws along the nation's coasts. A full 12 percent cut similar to that made in other federal agencies would have halted the Coast Guard's efforts against drug smugglers altogether. Yet Mr. Reagan increased the Coast Guard's duties by requiring it to stop ships on the high seas if the ships appear to be transporting illegal Haitian immigrants into this country. It is hard to see how the service can be asked to do more with less.

Under our systems, the principal burden of controlling crime properly falls on state and local government. The traditional role of the federal government has been to confront the national problems—organized crime, white-collar crime, public corruption, and drug abuse—and to provide both leadership and assistance to state and local law enforcement officials. There are also areas in which federal and state authorities share the jurisdiction. I am concerned that these reductions will burden state and local police with a disproportionate share of joint responsibilities. They mean less federal help for hard-pressed state and local law enforcement officials at a time when crime and the fear of it are increasing. With my support, Congress is acting to restore some of the funds which have been cut.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, once again we commemorate the anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. This year, our observance is held at a time when citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic and all nations under Communist domination have witnessed the tragic events in neighboring Poland. The menacing presence of Soviet military might in all nations surrounding Poland is a grim reminder of the cost of dissension in a nation where freedom remains a distant hope.

In Ukraine, the Soviet campaign against native culture, language, religion, and other traditions continues. In spite of the consequences, thousands of courageous Ukrainians maintain their resistance to the policy of Russification and other official actions by the Soviet Government to crush individual dignity and human rights. The group formed to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Final Act has faced constant persecution, imprisonment and degradation.

To those who have kept the flame of independence burning in the Ukrainian National Republic since the brutal Communist takeover in 1922, we must extend our hopes and prayers that they might join with us some day to celebrate this occasion in true freedom. I urge the Members of his body and the administration to renew their commitment to respect for human right and freedom throughout the world as we begin this session of the 97th Congress.●

A UNIQUE NEIGHBORHOOD IS PRESERVED—DITMAS PARK DESIGNATED A HISTORIC DISTRICT

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are privileged to represent urban districts know that the secret of a successful city is a collection of good neighborhoods with different types of housing, shops, parks and community facilities. But above all such a neighborhood must have a strong sense of community identity and neighborhood pride that serves to unify its residents.

One of the jewels of a neighborhood in New York City is Ditmas Park in the 13th Congressional District which I represent. Once a part of a 17th century Dutch holding called Van Ditmarsen Farm, Ditmas Park was developed at the beginning of the 20th century as a suburban middle-class residential community by Lewis Pounds. By 1908 a Ditmas Park Association was founded to protect and enhance the area with its substantial homes of varied architectural styles and its tree-lined pleasantly laid-out streets. By 1915 Ditmas Park in Flatbush had 187 homes on nine city blocks bounded by Dorchester Road on the north; Ocean Avenue on the east with one block extending across Ocean Avenue; Newkirk Avenue on the south; and the BMT subway tracks to the west just past 16th Street.

Recently the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission responded to the active interest, years of research, and lobbying carried on by

the Ditmas Park Association, the Flatbush Historical Society, and a score of elected community officials and community activists and designated Ditmas Park as a New York City Historic District. The Commission finally recognized what Brooklynites had known for 70 years—Ditmas Park is an architectural gem and a wonderful residential area worth protecting and preserving.

This official designation is in large part a tribute to the long and hard work of many Ditmas Park volunteers, ably led by Robert J. Miller, the president of the Ditmas Park Association and his able executive committee of Dale Berson, Benadette Di Falco, Kenneth Elstein, Bea Melnick, William Richardson, and Norman Williams. Irving Chobam of the Flatbush Historical Society played a key role in documenting the planning and architectural features that make this area such a unique feat of urban planning and design. Dozens of other community residents generously donated thousands of hours in this grand effort to preserve and protect the distinctive features of their neighborhood.

I am proud to have worked along with Borough President Howard Golden, State Senator Marty Markowitz, Assemblyman Melvin Miller, and State Committee Members Jacob Gold and Joni Yoswein to see that this area received its rightful recognition for its role in New York's development and history.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that someday I might have the opportunity to show you and other Members of the House this lovely neighborhood with its colonial revival homes, its pleasant streets and magnificent shade trees, which now will be preserved in all their glory. I am proud today to pay tribute to this community and its talented and dedicated leaders with whom I have had the privilege to work with in an effort to preserve and maintain our residential neighborhoods in New York as attractive, vital, and safe places in which to live and raise a family. Neighborhoods like Ditmas Park remain a key both to our Nation's past and future greatness, and every level of our government must continue to recognize, appreciate, and support their preservation.●

**A TRIBUTE TO ANTONIO
MENDEZ, A GREAT LEADER**

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I and Congressman CHARLES RANGEL address this legislative body today. A longtime friend and mentor, Antonio Mendez died earlier

this month. He left behind him, a legacy of public commitment to the Puerto Rican community of New York City.

Tony Mendez was a pioneer for all of us who followed in his footsteps and now hold public office. He was known to give 100-plus percent to this community which had great confidence and trust in his decisions and leadership.

As the Democratic district leader for East Harlem for more than 20 years which covered the two major decades in which the city experienced a large growth in Puerto Rican residents, Tony's accomplishments gave voice to the Puerto Rican community while opening the eyes of the city's leadership.

Perhaps his greatest accomplishment was encouraging Puerto Ricans and other minorities to exercise their right to vote, a difficult assignment since the State still required an English literacy test in the fifties. Tony's persistence paid off in increased participation by New York's hispanic and black population.

Tony will be sorely missed. We are certain however that his work will continue through the efforts of two of the strongest women the Puerto Rican community of New York has ever seen—Tony's survivors, his wife Isabel Negroni de Mendez and State senator Olga Mendez who replaced me in Albany.

Our hearts and sorrow go out to them, but also our pride in having known Antonio Mendez.●

CENTRAL AMERICA REDUX

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong tendency in American Government to consider every issue solely in terms of the political circumstances of the moment, and to forget that the pattern of events over time can be very instructive in determining an appropriate response to seemingly new and urgent crises. Virtually everything which is now being said about the situation in Central America has been said, with variations, many time previously in the history of U.S. relations with Latin America. Both the Reagan administration and its critics, of which I count myself one, seem at times more to be acting out the debates of decades past than to be formulating new or original initiatives likely to shape a future different from the grim memories of the past.

The following article illustrates this premise well, with particular reference to Nicaragua. This essay, authored by Hewson A. Ryan, former U.S. Amba-

sador to Honduras and now director of inter-American studies at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on December 11, 1981. I think it is well worth the attention of my colleagues in the House.

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 11, 1981]

THE U.S. IN CENTRAL AMERICA: A REPEAT PERFORMANCE?

(By Hewson A. Ryan)

It was Santayana who said that those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it. . . .

Just over half a century ago a United States president, in a gesture which the New York Times termed "of a pyrotechnic suddenness of Rooseveltian intensity," accused a Latin American government of supplying arms to a rebellious faction in a Central American nation at the behest of the Soviet Union. On Jan. 10, 1927, Calvin Coolidge submitted this message to the Congress. Two days later his vigorous and aggressive secretary of state, Frank Kellogg, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a lengthy document purportedly tracing Mexican involvement in supplying arms and military personnel to the forces of Juan Sacasa, who was seeking to overthrow the US-backed Diaz regime in Nicaragua.

The document alleged that Sacasa was dedicated to the establishment of a Bolshevik state, hostile to the US and threatening to the Panama Canal. The lengthy text detailed the objectives of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, a Moscow-supported organization formed to marshal Latin America against the US. Kellogg also presented photos and other evidence of the use of Mexican ships to move arms to the rebels. However, there was no conclusive evidence that Mexico had entered into any agreement with Moscow to overthrow US influence in Nicaragua. The parallels with the present administration's allegations of Soviet involvement in Nicaragua are latent.

At the same time an American admiral aboard the cruiser Rochester was directing the landing of US Marines at several points on the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua. For the purpose of "protecting US nationals" (a precedent used by President Johnson to justify Marine Corps landings in Santo Domingo in 1965) and "barring the entry of arms and munitions intended for the Sacasa forces" (this parallels current Washington talk of "blockades"), Marine detachments from the Navy transport Argonne established "neutral zones" initially as far as 40 miles inland and were soon defending the Nicaraguan capital Managua from an advancing rebel army.

Our European allies looked on askance. The British press spoke of the "indefensible Nicaraguan adventure" and of Washington's "definitely aggressive policy toward Latin America." In Paris semi-official commentators wrote of this as proof of the existence of American imperialism and of the transformation of the Monroe Doctrine from a "principle of defense" to a "postulate of a US protectorate" over Latin America. In Brazil leading newspapers accused the US of imperialism and spoke of the "scandalous and distorted use of the Monroe Doctrine."

The media these days bring us almost daily reports of European and Latin American doubts about the US posture in Central America and of hostile demonstrations

against the US in European and other world capitals.

The Congress at first listened respectfully to Secretary Kellogg's testimony and was circumspect about challenging his views. The government of Mexico, beset with horrendous internal religious and political strife, was fearful of possible US intervention over this and over questions of the expropriation of US-owned mineral and agricultural properties. The Mexican foreign minister hastened to issue a conciliatory statement terming his nation's interest in Nicaragua purely "spiritual." And even the rebel leader Sacasa was apparently cowed. He sent a statement to the Associated Press on the Coolidge message denying any agreements with Mexico, listing his claims to legitimacy, and concluding that, in view of President Coolidge's views, he would probably abandon his struggle rather than risk "an absurd and unequal war with the United States."

And so a minicrisis passed from the headlines. But the root causes continued to grow and fester in the area.

Sacasa temporarily disappeared from the scene, although he did reappear as duly elected president a few years later. But another obscure Nicaraguan revolutionary, Cesar Augusto Sandino, took up the struggle against foreign intervention in his homeland. With his martyr's death in 1933, he gave the continuing struggle a symbol and a name.

The US Marines were ashore in Nicaragua to stay for another five years of frustrating guerrilla warfare and attempts at social engineering. Young Marine lieutenants like "Chesty" Puller would have their first experience in jungle warfare in Nicaragua, experience which stood them in good stead as they led battalions, regiments, and divisions in similar combat in World War II. The frustrations of supervising elections and interpreting local laws made the State Department loath to extend these experiments into other Latin American nations for several decades.

The Congress, acquiescent at the onset of this particular incident, gradually became more concerned. Their interest sparked by a few reporters and columnists like Carlton Beals, concerned legislators began to question the reasons for US Marine expenditures in money and men in the jungles of Central America. By 1933 the executive had no choice but to plan the full withdrawal of US troops as the Congress enacted budget legislation prohibiting the expenditure of appropriated funds to send the Marines to Nicaragua.

Before the final departure from Nicaragua in 1933 the Marines left another legacy. This was the Nicaraguan National Guard, a constabulary designed to assure the integrity of the US-installed democratic electoral process. As commander of this elite body the Marines chose their most apt pupil, an aggressive English-speaking young officer—Anastasio Somoza. His and his progeny's tragic impact on Central America needs no telling here.

In the meantime the grinding poverty of the bulk of the population of Central America continued, and continues to this day. Economic statistics reflect favorable balances. In relative and real terms the commerce and industry of the area have shown steady positive movement. But it has been growth without economic or political justice. The rigid social and economic structures of centuries continue to prevail. The rich have become richer and the poor multiply only in numbers.

The more things change. . .

LIEUTENANT COLONEL RAY—A
VICTIM OF SENSELESS VIO-
LENCE

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 18, Lieutenant Colonel Charles Ray was gunned down in front of his Paris apartment while on his way to work at the U.S. Embassy. Lieutenant Colonel Ray was one of my constituents who will be remembered as a good citizen of the Springfield community and a top-ranking official in the U.S. Army. He had received numerous medals for his dedicated service to his country. Some of these were the Bronze Star, the Meritorious Service Medal with clusters, and the Army Commendation Medal with clusters. He will be truly missed by his friends and family and by the country he served.

This is yet another example of terrorism directed against the United States. U.S. citizens, American property and diplomatic installations abroad have become primary targets for terrorists in the recent months. This kind of willful attack must be brought to a halt. We must not let this problem get out of control so that terrorists think they can attack wherever, whoever, and whenever they want.

We will mourn Lieutenant Colonel Ray's death in the months to come and remember him for his contributions to his community and to his country. However, we must strive to eliminate such savage terrorist acts which not only claim innocent lives, such as Lieutenant Colonel Ray's, but also weaken the stability of our society.●

BOWING TO PEKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, concern has grown over the long delay in announcing the sale of defensive fighter aircraft to the Republic of China on Taiwan. The Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 guarantees that modern aircraft be provided to the Republic of China. In view of the fact that the Republic of China is a major trading partner and a strategically located bastion, its survival as a prosperous, viable nation is an obvious asset to the United States. Moreover, the readiness of the United States to keep

its commitments to the ROC is viewed as a special test case throughout Asia.

The Joliet, Ill., Herald-News, of January 15 gives this subject timely attention. As I believe that this editorial represents prevailing American opinion and is a hard-hitting, pertinent commentary on this issue, I include it at this point in my remarks.

The editorial follows:

[From the Joliet, Ill. Herald-News, Jan. 15, 1982]

BOWING TO PEKING

The contest of wills between Washington and Peking over the perspective sale of advanced U.S. fighter aircraft to Taiwan ended ignominiously recently when the Reagan administration threw in the towel.

In so doing, a president who prides himself on standing by America's traditional friends appeared to grant Peking a veto over what, if any, U.S. arms will be sold to the Nationalist government on Taiwan.

The Nationalist Chinese, whose air force relies mainly on aging F-5A, F-104, and F-100 fighters, had requested permission to buy F-16s. But the Nationalists would have accepted the new F-5G, the latest model in the Northrop export line.

Instead, they got nothing more than a vague promise to replace older fighters with "comparable" aircraft plus and extension of the agreement under which Taiwan co-produces the F-5E.

This hardly conforms to the spirit at least of the Taiwan Relations Act, which includes a congressionally mandated provision to provide adequate defensive weaponry to the Nationalist Chinese. Although the question of which fighters should be sold to Taiwan was always fraught with considerations as much political as military, a Nationalist air force boasting only 386 combat aircraft certainly needs to retain a technological edge over an opponent with roughly 5,300 planes.

The arms-supply provision of the Taiwan Relations Act also served as a tangible promise that the United States would not abandon an old friend simply because an alliance was no longer as convenient as it had once been.

The Reagan administration should be the last to forget that when America is seen to have cast aside a smaller friend, other friends in exposed locations begin to wonder whether it is time to reassess their own ties to Washington.

Put another way, the bad news for Taiwan won't be received well in such places as South Korea, Thailand, Pakistan, Israel, Turkey, and Jordan either.

The rationale for permitting Peking to have its way on the matter of a new fighter aircraft for Taiwan was that this would strengthen a Sino-American rapprochement intended principally to contain the Soviet Union.

Ironically, it may have just the reverse effect. The hard-headed realists in Peking may well be asking themselves now to what extent THEY can count on the United States in a pinch. If, as we suspect, the mainland Chinese are far more worried about the 46 Soviet army divisions on their northern borders than about regaining Taiwan, the concession from Washington may translate in Peking as an ominous failure of nerve.●

REPEALING LIVING EXPENSE DEDUCTIONS

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation to repeal those measures enacted at the close of the first session which resulted in the elimination of the \$3,000 limitation on living expense deductions for Members of Congress. My bill will also reduce by one-half, the maximum amount of outside income Members can earn each year.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 15 years, the growth of congressional salaries has been quite significant. Since 1965, Members' salaries have almost doubled. Congress can ill afford to promote the perception that it is lining its own pockets at the expense of constituents back home. Members currently receive salaries well in excess of that of the average American wage earner; the last thing we should do is adopt a windfall tax break for ourselves.

I call upon all my colleagues to join me in an effort to restore public confidence in Congress by passing this legislation. Congress cannot ask the American people to make temporary sacrifices to revive an ailing economy if Congress itself is unwilling to make these same sacrifices.

I might also add that I am somewhat disturbed by the manner in which this limitation was eliminated. Attaching the eliminating provision as a rider to black lung benefits legislation is not only a misleading perversion of the democratic process, but also perpetrates a cruel hoax on all who supported the black lung benefits legislation on its merits.

Any procedure dealing with compensation and benefits for Members of Congress should be dealt with openly. We owe that much to ourselves and, more importantly, to our constituents.●

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MILWAUKEE COMMITTEE SUPPORTING POLAND'S SOLIDARITY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in many communities throughout the United States and all the free world, spontaneous expressions of condemnation of the action of the military government of Poland have been raised, uniting freedom-loving people every-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

where with the suffering people of Poland. In my district in Milwaukee and its suburbs, several public demonstrations have been held bringing together individuals of various ethnic backgrounds and religions who are determined to have their voices heard and thereby lend strength and support to the Solidarity movement and all that it represents.

Mr. Speaker, at one such recent public gathering, hundreds of people attending, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing their deepest concern for the tragic events in Poland and their hope for a return to the path of reform. Because, Mr. Speaker, of the sincerity of this expression of support and because it exemplifies the true feelings of millions of people everywhere, I am pleased to share this resolution with my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

We, the Americans of Polish descent, and a host of citizens of other than Polish lineage, gathered here in Milwaukee on Saturday, January 2, 1982, raise our voices in solemn protest against barbarity and inhuman treatment of Poland's Solidarity movement, Lech Walesa, and Polish workers.

The military terror in Poland has already taken a heavy toll. Thousands of Solidarity leaders, activists, intellectuals, journalists, artists and writers have been thrown into prison and in military detention camps. Unarmed workers, resisting to be slaves, have been killed and some priests beaten.

The main goal of the establishment of martial law and assumption of rule by the military junta is the destruction of the free trade union Solidarity and the taking away of the democratic changes which have occurred since August 1980 and which are not in the interest of the Soviet imperialism.

We have no doubt that Moscow is heavily involved in the crackdown and military junta is under order of Soviet Russia.

On behalf of the Polish nation, unable to speak for itself, we Americans cannot be silent when a cruel black night and silence spreads over Poland.

We request that and immediate meeting of the United Nations General Assembly is called to condemn the criminal action of the Polish military junta.

We urge the Security Council of the United Nations:

1. To warn the Soviet Russia against any military intervention
2. To take steps to demand the end of martial law
3. The immediate release of all political prisoners
4. Resumption by the regime of peaceful dialogue with Lech Walesa and representatives of the Polish people.

We call attention to all that Jaruzelski's junta violated the Helsinki Accords and the United Nations' Covenant on Human Rights, to which both Poland and the Soviet Union are signatories.

We appeal to all the countries of the free world for a joint economic action and other sanctions against Soviet Russia which must inevitably follow if Jaruzelski's junta does not bring an end to repression.

We welcome and appreciate President Reagan's forceful declarations concerning the present situation in Poland where Polish people exercise their sovereign right of self determination.

January 27, 1982

We call on our Government to examine the possibility of the International Red Cross to be requested to investigate without delay the appalling conditions in which political prisoners are being held.

We appeal to our Government; to all American people; to all Ethnic groups and organizations and to American Labor Unions to step up food and medical assistance to Poland through volunteer agencies such as CARE, Catholic charities and the Catholic Hierarchy in Poland.

We support the Solidarity movement in its attempt to regain human and civil rights in Poland. We cannot permit that newly won freedom by the courageous people of Poland to be taken away by Soviet Russia and her puppet Warsaw regime.

This resolution is to be sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Resolution Committee:

EDMUND G.

BANASIKOWSKI.

LEONNE D. WOZINSKI.

JANUSZ OKSZA-

CZECHOWSKI.

Unanimously adopted by all freedom loving people present at the rally of Milwaukee Polonia held on this 2nd day of January in the year 1982 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.●

ROBERT J. MAHON RETIRES AS WILMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my constituents and a personal friend, Bob Mahon, who has just recently completed 2 years as president of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.

Born and raised in Pittsburgh, Bob attended Duquesne University before marrying the former Judith Ann Dishea in 1960. Three years later they moved to California where Bob had a position with Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., waiting. After working in Anaheim and San Diego, he was promoted to sales manager in Los Angeles. In 1972 Bob opened a new Firestone dealership in Los Angeles, and purchased Mercury Tire in Wilmington the following year. In 1980 he opened his third dealership in Inglewood.

Mr. Speaker, Bob has obviously led a very successful business life, but he has not done so by sacrificing his interest in, and his contribution to his community. He has served as the treasurer of Pop Warner Football, as president of the Wilmington Boys Club, and as member of the Wilmington Rotary Club. Robert served as assistant sergeant at arms at the International Rotary Convention in New York in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Bob for the many contributions he has made to his community, and we wish he and Judith, along with their 10 children, Sean, Daniel, Patrick, Terrence, Timothy, Kelly Ann, Robert, Brendan, Bryan, and Elizabeth Ann all the best in the years ahead.●

CHARITY, UNITY AND
FRATERNITY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus, a fraternal order of Catholic men, is this year, celebrating their 100th anniversary. I would like to take a moment to recognize what I believe to be one of our Nation's finest service organizations.

The Knights of Columbus has as its fundamental tenant, charity. When thinking of the selfless contributions of this fine fraternal order, I recall the words of Walt Whitman. "Behold, I do not give lectures or a little charity, when I give I give myself." The Knights of Columbus do give of themselves whether it be assisting Italian earthquake victims, providing programs for our physically handicapped, or by promoting family and civic virtues.

The Knights of Columbus was founded a century ago by Father Michael J. McGivney in New Haven, Conn. Today their Supreme Knight, Virgil C. Deckert, presides over more than 7,100 local councils worldwide. These councils, the foundation upon which the order is built, are in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, the Virgin Islands, and Panama. In February of this year, the Knights of Columbus will add yet another nation to this list with the establishment of a council in the Dominican Republic.

The 1,350,000 members of the Knights of Columbus have as their guiding principles "charity, unity and fraternity."

The Knights of Columbus allows each of its 7,100 councils to establish and maintain programs suited to their communities. The value of this approach is reflected in the diversity and uniqueness of council programs.

I would like to cite one example from a council located in my congressional district, the Trenton Knights of Columbus Council No. 355, which is presently under the stewardship of Grand Knight Nicholas J. Solimando.

The Trenton Knights have established the Holy See Center of Learning which assists in the spiritual development of the area's physically and

mentally handicapped. This center is a monument to the dedication and contribution of the Knights of Columbus.

The Knights have provided 100 years of outstanding service in communities throughout the world. During times when man's humanity toward man has been severely tested, the Knights of Columbus have stood firm. If one were to try to put the spirit of the Knights of Columbus into words, I think the Latin phrase "Homo sum, humani nil a me alienum puto" or "I am a man, and nothing human can be of indifference to me," would come close.

I would like to congratulate the Knights of Columbus for a century of service. I know the next 100 years will find a growing strength for this fine organization.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join with my colleagues in the House in this honorable commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

For over half a century, the Ukrainian people have kept ablaze, against insurmountable odds, a courageous commitment to personal freedom and national independence. Although the Soviet Union has superimposed a political and social structure upon the Ukraine, it has not weakened the resolve of the Ukrainian people in their quest for national self-determination.

The struggle in the Ukraine is the same ongoing struggle witnessed today in all of the captive nations, where violations of human rights are perpetuated. As the oppressed people of these captive nations continue to resist Soviet repression and domination, we give voice to their aspirations for freedom and pray that they will persevere with honor and courage.●

THE SUPER BOWL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to say how exhilarating this weekend's Super Bowl was for me and for so many Americans who were attuned to the excitement in the Silverdome. The people of Detroit have been greatly honored by the success of this historic athletic contest. They should feel rightfully proud, along with fellow

Michigan residents, to have hosted the very first Super Bowl held outside the Sun Belt region.

It was a great game and it generated high spirits and comradery among the 81,000 fans lucky enough to be at the Silverdome. The game was telecast to another 100 million Americans and to countless viewers abroad. In fact, the level of interest was just phenomenal. I do not think anyone walked away disappointed from that splendid contest, least of all, the citizens of Detroit. After the last out-of-town guest caught his or her plane home, the Detroit economy was ahead by \$60 million. It's terrific to see my district get a long-deserved break.

I feel the phenomenal success of Super Bowl XVI makes it an appropriate subject to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues. The game was certainly well attended by Members of Congress, including Congressman KEMP, who probably couldn't help but be reminded of his own days of glory on the football grid. Our Vice President, GEORGE BUSH, seemed right at home at the Silverdome. He told a Detroit sportswriter he was betting against the President's home State team. I guess it is not easy to assert your individuality in this town and still come out a winner.

But, perhaps the most pressing question is: Did the best team win? Well, that is a tough one to answer. I have made a career out of rooting for the underdog, but with both teams being less celebrated than they deserve to be, both can be considered underdogs. So, true to form, I pulled for the underdog and my team won. But seriously, who could be anything but thrilled to watch a 25-year-old novice quarterback with a last name like Montana end up with the game's most valuable player award. You could not avoid being caught up in the excitement watching the San Francisco 49'ers tenaciously defending their lead against the Bengals' attempted third quarter comeback.

I would like to congratulate both teams on the fine game they played this weekend. But I want to save some accolades for the people of Detroit. Their hospitality was a beautiful thing to see. Everyone from the owners of the splendid hotels that housed our guests to the policemen who were out on the streets keeping the traffic flow orderly, deserve to be commended for putting Detroit's best foot forward. It just proves you do not have to head down to the Sun Belt to encounter warm, gracious people.●

FRESNO STATE BULLDOGS

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, over the years, many of my colleagues have had opportunities to boast of outstanding athletic achievements that have occurred in their districts. Today, I am most pleased to announce that for the first time in history the Fresno State Bulldogs have been ranked among the top 20 basketball teams in the Nation by both the Associated Press and United Press International.

I wish to commend Coach Boyd Grant, the players, and the community of Fresno for the hard work and tremendous support that made this possible.●

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY
RESOLUTION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today, as perhaps no other time in our recent history, we see firsthand the historic determination of the Soviet Union to dominate and subjugate their neighbors. Afghanistan is still fresh in our minds. Thank God the brave people of that nation still are resisting their oppressors. Now Poland is in turmoil. Every vestige of freedom is being stamped out, and in the words of our President:

The Soviet Union bears a heavy and direct responsibility for the repression in Poland.

None of us as students of history should be surprised. The totalitarian government of the U.S.S.R. despises freedom and democracy and religion, and its actions today hark back to prior oppression and bloodshed in Hungary, Czechoslovakia; and, earlier, the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

To some of this generation, the names "Lithuania," "Latvia," and "Estonia" strike no responsive chord. The U.S.S.R. is delighted. It has spent 40 years trying to erase from the memory of people the fact that these Baltic Republics ever existed, and if it could, it would rip every reference to them from every history book and map in the world.

Why?

Because in 1940, during the chaos which preceded World War II, the Soviet Union seized these three republics and forcefully incorporated them into the U.S.S.R. Freedoms were abolished, and Soviet oppression, as we continue to see it today, was inflicted

upon these proud and courageous peoples. Then on June 14, 1941, the U.S.S.R. began mass deportations of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia in an attempt to further break their national will.

These three republics, free and proud, members of the League of Nations, and recognized by the world as sovereign governments, were swallowed overnight by the Soviet Union which continues to occupy them and deny their peoples basic rights, religious freedoms, and self-determination.

It can be said to the credit of the United States that our Government steadfastly has refused to recognize their inclusion in the U.S.S.R. and continues to recognize the Baltic Republics as sovereign states entitled to stand independently among the other nations of the world. And the people of the Baltic Republics, likewise, have refused to let the light of hope go out as they have struggled and suffered for 40 years under Soviet domination and oppression.

Those of us who cherish freedom can show our solidarity with the captive Baltic peoples by supporting the joint resolution, which I am introducing today, establishing an annual observance of Baltic Freedom Day on June 14, the anniversary of the mass deportation to Siberia. On that day all Americans, and especially those of Baltic heritage, will draw attention to the continuing oppression of the Baltic Republics and with one voice call for freedom.

The Soviet Union must know that time will not blot out their shame and that their crimes of today will only recall more vividly their crimes of yesterday.

The people of the Baltic Republics must know and draw strength from the fact that Americans share their desire for freedom and national independence and have resolved to keep their plight before all the people of the world, including their capturers.●

GARTH REEVES, JR.

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Miami were greatly saddened by the death of Garth Reeves, Jr. Garth was only 30 years old when he died earlier this month, but he was already a respected journalist and community leader. He was the managing editor of the Miami Times, a newspaper that was founded by his family and had served the black community in Miami for over 50 years.

I would like to include in the RECORD a letter I sent to the Miami Times expressing the great sense of loss I and all of Miami feel at the death of this outstanding young man.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.LETTER TO THE EDITOR,
Miami Times Newspaper:

Earlier this month, the people of Florida's 13th Congressional District lost a most valuable leader.

The death from cancer of Garth Reeves, Jr. on January 7th took away from our South Florida community not only an active dedicated young man, but a person who was going to provide future important and needed leadership for our city.

Garth was the only son of Garth C. Reeves, Sr., publisher of the newspaper that was founded a half-century ago by the Reeves family and has grown into a principal voice in the black community.

Perhaps his father said it best, "He always thought he was going to change things. He always believed this city was going to be a great black metropolis someday. He wanted to be a part of that. I think the community has lost a true leader. He was just coming into his own."

As the Miami Herald reported, Garth, Jr. "... has received six national awards from the National Newspaper Publishers Association, a black newspaper group. Last week, he was honored by the Black Archives for his efforts to restore order to Miami after the riots in the spring of 1980.

In following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather, who founded the paper, the younger Reeves vowed a vow to his hometown. 'I live here because I choose to live here,' he told an interviewer last year. 'I'm not a person who's going to leave Miami. It's in bad shape, but it's going to turn around.'"

Garth, Jr. has left us in Miami both a legacy and an obligation to make our community the kind of place that he could have always continued to give his best to.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM LEHMAN,
Member of Congress.●FACTS ABOUT FEDERAL CREDIT
UNIONS

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DUAB. Mr. Speaker, as a former president of a credit union, I am keenly aware of the strong contribution that credit unions make to our economy and our society. Credit unions have never backed away from deregulation and have never been afraid to compete in order to provide their members with the best possible services.

Today I want to bring to the attention of my House colleagues an informative brochure developed by the National Association of Federal Credit Unions entitled, "Facts About Federal Credit Unions." Federal credit unions are chartered and regulated by the

Federal Government. According to NAFCU, the national trade organization which represents Federal credit unions, there are over 12,000 FCU's nationwide with total assets of over \$40 billion. More than 26 million individuals belong to Federal credit unions.

Federal credit unions are organized as cooperatives and are nonprofit-making. Control and management of these institutions rests with credit union members. Further, volunteers play an important part in the operations of many Federal credit unions. In my opinion, no financial institution embodies American democratic principles as closely as credit unions. I am pleased to submit the NAFCU brochure for the RECORD and I urge all my colleagues to read it carefully.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

Expanded legislation, deregulation and a dynamic economy have propelled credit unions into the mainstream of today's highly competitive financial marketplace.

Credit unions are more prepared than ever to handle the challenges and opportunities which they will encounter in the 1980s. As these challenges are met, credit unions are assuming a greater role in assisting consumers with their savings and borrowing needs.

Federal credit unions (FCUs) have been in existence since 1934. An accelerated growth pattern within the Federal credit union community began in the 50s and today, there are over 12,000 FCUs nationwide with total assets of over \$40 billion and more than 26 million members.

HISTORY OF FCUS

Credit unions began in Germany during the middle of the 19th century. The principal objective of the founding fathers of the credit union movement was to combat usurious rates and to provide consumers with an opportunity to borrow at reasonable rates. Formed as cooperatives, credit unions provided a framework for people to borrow and save together.

The first credit union in the United States was organized in New Hampshire in 1908. Credit unions were chartered only under state law until the Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934. The Farm Credit Administration was the first agency to administer the Act. This responsibility was transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, then to the Federal Security Agency, then to the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and finally the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA)—an independent regulatory agency for credit unions—was formed in 1970.

While NCUA has primary authority for regulating the activities and assuring the safety and soundness of Federal credit unions, other federal agencies also have an impact on FCU operations. For instance, Federal credit unions are subject to the Federal Reserve's Regulation D reserve requirements. Also, credit unions are represented on the Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee (DIDC). Along with the heads of the other federal financial regulatory agencies, NCUA's Board Chairman is a voting member of this committee. The DIDC's decisions, however, do not affect FCUs directly. The NCUA Board is free to follow or deviate from DIDC actions. In most cases, NCUA's decisions have put Fed-

eral credit unions in the forefront of deregulation.

A Federal credit union is a cooperative, not-for-profit financial institution organized to promote thrift among its members. It is member owned and controlled. FCU members are provided with a safe, convenient place to save and to obtain loans at reasonable rates. Deposits are insured up to \$100,000 per account by the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (NCUSIF).

The asset size of FCUs ranges from a few hundred dollars to almost a billion dollars. As of the middle of 1981, there are over 1,600 Federal credit unions with assets under \$100,000; some 2,900 with assets under \$250,000; close to 3,500 with assets under \$1,000,000; and over 4,000 with assets over \$1,000,000.

A FCU encourages its members to use share accounts to accumulate savings as a means of building economic security. FCUs offer a wide variety of consumer loans such as auto, mobile home, home improvement and debt consolidation. They were granted long-term mortgage lending powers late in 1978; however, few have entered the market because of economic conditions. Most provide financial counseling for members.

Many FCUs offer credit cards, direct deposit, a wide range of savings instruments (such as All-Savers Certificates and Individual Retirement Accounts), share drafts (which are checking account instruments on which members receive interest), free insurance programs such as life saving and credit life, travelers checks, money order and check cashing services.

FCU operations are based on savings by members in the form of share purchases. Many FCU members accumulate savings through payroll deductions from their paychecks. The development of systematic savings plans is a basic purpose of credit unions. Loans are made out of funds accumulated from these savings. A FCU's board of directors has the authority to set loan limits and loan policies. Applications for loans are approved by a credit committee elected by the FCU members or by loan officers appointed by the credit committee. Loan approvals depend on the applicants meeting a CU's credit-worthiness standards.

FCU membership is limited to persons having a common bond of occupation, association and to groups within a well-defined neighborhood, community or rural district. For example, a credit union's membership can be made up of factory or store employees; members of a church, fraternal society, labor union, farm organization or other well-defined association; or the residents of a natural trade area, rural community or rural district. To become a credit union member, one must be part of the common bond group. Many credit unions have a once-a-member-always-a-member policy, which means that even if a member leaves the common bond environment, he or she may continue to use the CU's services. Most also permit members of the immediate family to join the credit union.

FCU control and management is in the hands of the credit union members. A board of directors and a credit committee are elected by the members. The board elects the officers from its own membership and appoints a supervisory committee. The supervisory committee has the responsibility to review and evaluate the performance of elected officials and employees. No director, except the treasurer, may receive compensation. In some cases, especially during the CU's first year or two, the treasurer often

serves without pay or for a nominal salary. Volunteerism is a unique and vital aspect of a CU's makeup.

A FCU's success hinges on its ability to meet its members' needs, to keep up with its competitors and to make prudent borrowing and investment decisions. Today, competition means offering convenience, financial education, an array of savings programs and a variety of services. Credit unions have been active in developing savings plans.●

SERVICEMEN STILL UNACCOUNTED FOR

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today marks the ninth anniversary of the cease-fire which supposedly provided for the return of all prisoners and accounting of all our missing in the same timeframe as the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. It never happened.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to remember the 57,692 war dead and the 2,500 still listed as missing from the war in Southeast Asia. I cannot stress enough that, in light of the evidence we have received in the past 9 years, we must act now to secure information on the American servicemen still unaccounted for. I have asked the President and the Defense Department not to let up on pressuring the Government of Vietnam for information on these men. The families of these brave men are counting on us.

Next month, I have received word, a U.S. delegation will travel to Southeast Asia for the purpose of securing information on Americans still missing. I applaud this action, but I also stress that any relations or foreign aid to the Government of Vietnam hinges on the return of all POW/MIA's, according to the 1973 Paris Peace Accord. Vietnam's past record on that score could not be more dishonorable.●

HOMES CAN NOW BE THE CENTER OF FAMILY ACTIVITY, EARNING, AND LEARNING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the advances in the computer industry in recent years have enabled the average American to have more control over his life.

Because the home computer allows a person to work and learn without leav-

ing home, every person has greater freedom to learn and work wherever he wants. Wherever there is a telephone and an electrical outlet, a home office can be set up.

I am excited about this new concept, and I want to share an article explaining it with you and my fellow colleagues. This article appeared in the Atlanta Constitution business section on January 13, to give the story of several people in Georgia who are already taking advantage of this new freedom.

The good experiences these folks have had with their home computers serve as examples of the way our society will function in the very near future.

The article follows:

[From The Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 3, 1982]

SHE'S A COMMUTE BY HOME COMPUTER
(By Debbie Weil)

Industry is moving back to the cottage, say the experts, as advances in personal computer systems and communications technology make possible "telecommuting."

"There definitely will be a trend toward more working at home as the electronics industry develops," predicts Esmond Lyons Jr., a management consultant specializing in the computer industry for California-based SRI International.

"In 10 years, probably 10 to 20 percent of clerical or creative type work could be done at home with very little attendance at the office," Lyons said, noting that he often writes reports at home on his Apple II computer and then transmits them to the office over the telephone line.

"It boggles the mind," Lyons added. "The potential is incredible."

In his book "The Third Wave," futurist Alvin Toffler predicts a significant portion of the work force will migrate back to the home during the 1980s, given such factors as the "economic trade-off between transportation and telecommunication."

Some may object to "telecommuting," he wrote, citing the loss of face-to-face contact and the potential conflict for women who have been "struggling to get out of the home." For others, the "electronic cottage," as Toffler calls it, may be a dream come true.

Donna Davenport, who lives in rural Woodstock, may * * * room to begin her workday.

While Jessica plays nearby with the family dog, Mrs. Davenport sits before her word processor, which is connected by telephone line with the central word processing telephone.

Lanier's marketing literature notes that telestaffing can reduce a company's space requirements, cut labor costs by taking advantage of part-time work and bring productive people back into the work force. For employees, the benefits cited include elimination of commuting costs, flexible scheduling and an opportunity to remain in the work force.

"Some of the most productive people in your office could be working at home," the company notes in its marketing pitch.

Vaughn said the Telestaff unit, which includes a mode for connecting with a central word processing system, leases for \$150 to \$175 per month. A complete home system, including a Lanier word processor, will lease for less than \$500 per month, he said.

In addition to clerical work, futurist Toffler identifies such tasks as research and analysis as particularly suited to the electronic cottage.

He also lists salespeople, architects, designers, psychologists, art dealers, investment counselors, insurance agents, and lawyers as examples of professionals who could work at home.

Ed Pope, a commodity broker in Atlanta with E. F. Hutton & Co., concurs. "I think eventually everybody in this industry will be at home, working with a quote machine and a personal computer. I think that's where I'll be in five years."

Pope already owns a personal computer, which he uses for analysis of commodity prices and other research. But he keeps it at the office so he can use the firm's Wide Area Telephone Service lines to cut down on the expense of making daily long-distance calls for the latest market information.

Jeff Producers, a stockbroker with Johnson Lane Space Smith & Co. in Atlanta, has two personal computers—one at home and one at his office. Producers' home computer goes to work about 4:30 every afternoon after the stock market closes. First the computer gets an updated data base of stock prices over the telephone from a central computer in New York. Then, using a program Producers devised, it spends "two or three hours making charts and graphs and some decisions. I tear off (the printout) and take it to work the next morning," Producers said.

He estimates he does about four hours of "homework" each night in addition to putting in a full day at the office. By doing his research and analysis at home, Producers said, "my selling time is free." His computer's analysis of prices has had "a substantial impact on my income," he added.

Neither Pope nor Producers can place buy or sell orders from home through their personal computers, a practice not yet accepted by the securities industry. "That's sometime off," said Lewis Holland, manager of Robinson-Humphrey Company Inc.'s downtown office. He foresees "rule changes by the stock exchange to enable brokers to place orders from home."

However, it is possible to set up shop at home as an independent licensed broker, if you can afford to purchase a stock exchange seat.

No one has done that yet in Atlanta—perhaps because start-up costs for such a cottage operation are in the several-hundred-thousand-dollar range.

Even a personal computer system for the at-home researcher can be expensive. For example, the average price for the popular Apple II personal computer system, including memory, video display and printer, is now about \$3,500, according to Steven Seale, sales manager of CompuShop of Georgia Inc.

But that cost should go down dramatically in the next several years, according to SRI's Lyons. He predicts that a personal computer system complete with software will sell in the \$750 range by 1985.

"The bottom line will be lifestyle," said E. F. Hutton's Pope. "(Personal computers) will allow you to live in a location other than close to where you work. If I had my druthers, I would like to live on a small farm."

"The disadvantage to me is you would not get out of your house. Think about that for a while." ●

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON JOBS BILLS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity will hold joint hearings on employment and training policy in Washington, D.C., on February 22, 23, 25, and 26. The purpose of these hearings is to hear testimony on all employment training bills referred to either subcommittee, including H.R. 5320, the Community Partnership for Employment and Training Act, which I introduced January 25.

Persons interested in testifying at these hearings should submit a written request to Susan Grayson, staff director, B346-A, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 or to Bob Guttman, counsel, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, 4230 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. It is expected that considerable interest will be expressed in these hearings and requests to testify will be numerous. All requests must be in written form and must be received no later than Friday, February 5, 1982.

Any questions regarding these hearings may be directed to Carole Schanzer, House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, phone (202) 225-1927 or to Violet Thompson, Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, phone (202) 224-6470 or (202) 224-6306. ●

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVITY CHANGES FOR 1980

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of 1981, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported some sorry statistics relating to our Nation's productivity for the year 1980. The sad news is that productivity, as measured by output per employee hour, fell in most U.S. industries.

Among the biggest declines in productivity were two of our most vital industries—motor vehicle manufacturing and steel production. They dropped in productivity by 4.4 percent and 3.7 percent respectively.

The attached official report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics makes for very sobering reading. It should serve as an impetus for all of us to work

toward a comprehensive effort to boost our Nation's productivity. When we look at productivity statistics and realize that, overall, our country's productivity declined by 0.3 percent in 1980 while productivity rates grew by nearly 10 percent in Japan for the same period, we come to realize that improving productivity will not be easy—just necessary.

The full report follows:

BLS REPORTS ON INDUSTRY PRODUCTIVITY CHANGES FOR 1980

Productivity, as measured by output per employee hour, fell in 1980 in a majority of the industries measured, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. Although a number of important industries, such as coal mining, petroleum refining, and major household appliances registered significant gains, the slowdown in most industries was consistent with the situation in the nonfarm business sector as a whole, which had a productivity decline of 0.3 percent in 1980.

In manufacturing, productivity fell 4.4 percent in 1980 in the motor vehicle industry, the second consecutive decline. Output plummeted 28.2 percent as demand dropped for passenger cars, trucks, truck trailers, and buses; employee hours in this industry were reduced by 24.9 percent. The steel industry also had its second consecutive decline in productivity, falling 3.7 percent in 1980. Output in this industry was down significantly due to a decrease in demand from such key markets as motor vehicles, construction, and appliances. A major productivity decline of 13.2 percent occurred in the construction machinery industry as output fell 19.7 percent, due to poor conditions in the construction industry. Productivity in the gray iron foundry industry declined 6.0 percent as output dropped a steep 21.7 percent. Other large manufacturing industries with productivity declines that can be associated with large output drops were motors and generators (-4.1 percent), household furniture (-2.2 percent), and sawmills (-1.9 percent). Output fell more than 10 percent in 1980 in these three industries.

However, a number of manufacturing industries experienced productivity gains in 1980. For many of these industries, the productivity increases reflected declines in output associated with even larger reductions in hours. In the fluid milk industry, for example, productivity grew 5.7 percent as output fell 0.1 percent and hours dropped 5.5 percent. Productivity grew 4.9 percent in the household appliance industry as output declined 6.8 percent and hours fell 11.1 percent. The petroleum refining industry had a productivity gain of 4.4 percent as output was down 6.4 percent and hours dropped 10.3 percent.

Among the mining industries, coal mining, after falling almost every year in the past decade, increased 12.6 percent in 1980. Coal output grew 6.4 percent due to increased demand as a petroleum substitute, growing exports, and stockpiling in anticipation of a strike in 1981, while hours fell 5.5 percent. However, productivity declines occurred in the other mining industries covered, with copper mining (recoverable metal) dropping 7.4 percent, nonmetallic minerals down 6.0 percent, and iron mining (usable ore) declining 0.2 percent.

Among transportation and utility industries, productivity changes were mixed. Productivity dropped 6.1 percent in air transportation, the first productivity decline

since the measure was begun in 1947, as output fell. Productivity in intercity trucking fell 4.5 percent, the fourth consecutive decline, as output dropped 9.7 percent due to decreased shipments of consumer products, construction materials, and petroleum. Electric and gas utilities had a productivity decline of 2.2 percent, based on a small increase in output and a larger gain in hours. Telephone communications, on the other hand, had a productivity gain of 6.6 percent, because of a large gain in output.

In trade and services, productivity declined in hotels and motels (-7.7 percent), laundries and dry cleaning (-6.8 percent), gasoline stations (-3.5 percent), and eating and drinking places (-2.0 percent). Output fell in all of these industries. Conversely, productivity in drug stores rose 6.9 percent, as output was up. New car dealers had a productivity gain of 4.4 percent, based on a sharp drop in output and an even steeper drop in hours. Retail food stores had a small productivity gain of 0.2 percent, as output was up 2.6 percent.

The attached table presents indexes of output per employee hour for the selected industries for the last 7 years. Although the output per employee hour measures relate output to the hours of all employees engaged in each industry, they do not measure only the specific contributions of labor, capital, or any other single factor of production. Rather, they reflect the joint effects of many influences, including new technology, capital investment, the level of output, capacity utilization, energy use, and managerial skills, as well as the skills and efforts of the work force.

Additional data for these measures, such as average rates of change for all the components of the measures back to 1947, are available from the BLS upon request. Many of the measures have been revised back to 1972, due to the introduction of more current data. Measures for the few remaining industries will be released when they become available in the near future. The forthcoming bulletin, "Productivity Measures for Selected Industries, 1954-1980," will include data back to 1954 for many industries. Data on output per hour of all persons and related cost measures for the private business sector as well as nonfarm business, manufacturing, and nonfinancial corporations are reported in the quarterly BLS press release, "Productivity and Costs."●

ONE CONSTITUENT'S VIEW OF THE ECONOMY RECOVERY PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month one of my constituents, Mr. Max Levine, attended the Star Lakes Condominium Sunday Breakfast and offered his view of the President's economic program. I was so impressed with his remarks, I asked him to put them in writing.

I believe Mr. Levine has given us a very straightforward and honest evaluation of the inequities involved in the President's program, and I hope my

colleagues will take note of his comments.

MIAMI, FLA., December 28, 1981.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEHMAN: This letter is at your request that I put into writing my remarks made at the Star Lakes Sunday Breakfast at an open forum. There may be some deletions and some additions as I never speak with prepared notes. But in essence the thoughts and expressions remain. Truthfully, I am much more effective when speaking with an audience in attendance. But a promise is a promise.

When the subject of funds to aid the elderly and the needy comes to the fore, our administration is sympathetic but speaks of hard times and the need for all of us to make sacrifices in these trying times. The usual excuse for cutbacks in services, that it would put a further tax burden on the working and middle income taxpayer, who is already staggering under the blow of an ever increasing inflation. Quite true on the face of it, but what about the thousands of millionaires who pay little or no tax at all. What about the depletion credits given to oil companies, the giveaways to the tobacco industry, the dairy giants, all literally bathing in profits. An oil company buying a billion dollar retail outlet, Montgomery Ward, in the face of exorbitant oil profits and further enriched by depletion credits.

And let us not be fooled by the T.V. commercials showing the oil companies putting all their excess money into exploration in our country. Congressman Jim Wright once brought the truth to the surface when he stated that most of the exploration activity is being done today by little groups of wildcatters using their limited supply of funds in hopes to strike oil. Very few succeed, but they take the gamble.

One of the most destructive forces to our country is the growth of the conglomerates who are allowed to penetrate every facet of our industrial and farming enterprise, then using their financial muscle to squelch small competition and create an unfair price structure that we the public have to absorb.

Mr. Congressman, if this country is ever to pull out of this financial crisis, we must completely revise our tax system and close the preferential treatment loopholes existing for the privileged few at the expense of the underprivileged many. Then and then only will the expression with "Liberty and Justice for all" be meaningful.

MAX LEVINE.

THE SPACE PROGRAM

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting, for the benefit of my colleagues in the House, a recent op-ed article from the Washington Post written by Dr. Michael Lipschutz concerning the serious consequences of funding cuts for basic research. While Dr. Lipschutz is particularly concerned with the NASA planetary materials program, I know that he speaks for many scientists at Purdue University and other institutions in pointing out the crucial role basic scientific re-

search programs play in training new generations of scientists. I know that you will find his comments informative and revealing.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 1982]

THE SAVAGING OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

(By Michael E. Lipschutz)

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND.—Last month I sat down with my research staff—eight talented young scientists—and told them what the latest round of proposed cuts in space-science funding will do to their careers. It was a somber meeting.

On Dec. 2, President Reagan's science adviser, George Keyworth, indicated the administration plans to cut back NASA funding so severely that early in 1983 the United States will no longer have a Solar System Exploration Program. The public is most familiar with this program through such missions as Voyager I and II that passed the planets Jupiter and Saturn and are now en route to Uranus.

Under Presidents Ford and Carter, space-science funding was curtailed, and this, coupled with inflation, removed all but the barest bones from the Solar System Exploration Program. The program cost \$175 million for basic research in fiscal 1981—about 88 cents per person in the United States. NASA directed \$9 million of that sum to the Planetary Materials Program, which supports all studies on meteorites, lunar samples, cosmic dust and even some terrestrial samples. What the present administration proposes would destroy even these bare bones.

Please understand that research money is not parceled out arbitrarily. Only the best science can be and is funded. Scientists in U.S. universities and research centers submit proposals describing their research and its significance to NASA. NASA in turn sends these proposals to experts for evaluation.

My research program passed all of these hurdles, and for the past few years my research group conducted research on meteorites and lunar samples for about \$73,000 annually. What were these funds used for? They were used to pay salaries to those students I talked to; that is, for graduate students doing research for their PhD degrees, for co-workers who already have PhDs but want to learn new techniques and approaches, and for a small portion of my salary. These funds bought chemicals and equipment. In other words, the money was spent on Earth, in the United States.

What did these funds produce? They produced a lot of knowledge on the genesis and evolution of solid objects during formation of the solar system, on the behavior of matter at high temperatures and pressures, on the nature of the solid state and on the Antarctic; they could produce a lot more knowledge. I won't dwell on this because the absolute worth of knowledge is incalculable. I will point out, however, that these funds led to the discovery of two processes; a method for producing industrial diamonds artificially, which is being used in this country and abroad, and a technique for extracting elements from the earth or in space that ultimately may prove very useful.

Knowledge gained was taken to the classroom, where undergraduates learned that science can be understood and applied. Finally, the funds led to the production of about 10 students with PhD degrees. Today, most are working for such companies as IBM, Shell and Procter and Gamble, not in space research. These former students are

using the knowledge and techniques they learned at Purdue to produce better solid-state devices, develop improved catalysts for chemical reactions and explore energy sources.

In anticipation of the administration's termination of Solar System Exploration, most research grants for fiscal 1982—my own included—have been cut severely. Some were terminated. All of these grants survived intense scrutiny and all were deemed to be very important scientifically. Officials in NASA and the National Science Foundation are trying desperately to keep as many productive groups as possible functioning at a "starvation level" this year in hope that public pressure will cause the administration to reconsider its decision to terminate Solar System Exploration.

If nothing is done now, solar-system exploration is dead in this country, at least for the next few decades. It will cost much more to resurrect this program later than to continue it now. Worse still, the United States will have handed over world leadership in space to others.●

SIBERIAN SEVEN

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the recess I had the privilege of meeting with the Siberian Seven in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, where they have been living in virtual captivity for the past 3½ years, as they actively pursue emigration to the United States in order to pursue their religious beliefs.

The Siberian Seven are Peter and Augustina Vashchenko; three of their daughters: Lida, 30, Lyubam, 29, and Lila, 24; and Maria Chmykhalov and her son, Timothy, 19. They are from Chernogorsk, a small mining town located 2,000 miles east of Moscow. Both families are members of the Russian Pentecostal faith, a fundamentalist group that Soviet authorities have tried unsuccessfully to exterminate since the Stalin era.

Members of the Vashchenko and Chmykhalov families have suffered job discrimination, firings, beatings, forced abduction of their children for reeducation in state orphanages, terms in labor camps and psychiatric hospitals, and mysterious deaths in their never-ending efforts to practice their religious beliefs—a right granted to them under the Soviet constitution.

The Vashchenko family have tried to emigrate since 1963, but have not succeeded. In 1978, they received an invitation to emigrate from a Presbyterian Church in Selma, Ala., but again the Vashchenko family were refused exist visas.

Later, Peter Vashchenko returned to the U.S. Embassy with a letter of invitation issued by the State Department. When the Soviet guards who were posted outside the gates of the

Embassy refused to allow the family admittance, they rushed through the gates and into the American compound. The Vashchenko's 17-year-old son, John, was wrestled to the ground by the Soviets and taken away. Nine days later, it was learned that John had been beaten close to death and returned to Chernogorsk.

Mr. Speaker, since July 27, 1978, the Siberian Seven have remained in a small room within the U.S. Embassy. Peter and Augustina Vashchenko have not seen their son John since they witnessed him being taken away by the Soviets. Nor have they seen their nine other children and countless relatives who remain in Chernogorsk today under constant pressure and harassment.

Since Christmas, Augustina and Lida Vashchenko have been on a hunger strike, and reports from Moscow this weekend have said that they have stopped taking liquids that are necessary to keep them alive.

Augustina and Lida Vashchenko, Mr. Speaker, may not live through the week. Immediate action must be taken to secure the basic human rights that the Siberian Seven so righteously deserve. I urge my colleagues in the House to telephone Secretary Haig's office and Washington and voice your concern, and urge him to make the Siberian Seven, as well as those of all faiths who are persecuted because of their religion, a major focal point in his dealings this week with Minister Gromyko in Geneva.●

SUPER BOWL XVI

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I was among the tens of thousands of sports fans who traveled to the Detroit suburb of Pontiac, Mich., last weekend for Super Bowl XVI. I came away from that event with some very favorable impressions, not only about the ability of the San Francisco 49ers to play football, but also about the host city of Detroit.

I have attended super bowls in several other cities and, in my judgment, Detroit did as fine a job in hosting this major sporting event as any of the others. Mayor Coleman Young and his administration deserve considerable credit for the masterful job in planning for the more than 80,000 spectators who turned out for the game.

The crush of visitors put the city to the test, and I think the unanimous opinion of super bowl attendees would be that it passed with flying colors. Detroit is a supercity. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Michi-

gan Governor William G. Milliken for the role his administration played in making the super bowl a success and for the warm welcome he extended to visitors to the State.●

TRIBUTE TO WALTER KNOTT

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention the recent passing of a truly great American, the late Walter Knott. I would like to pay a brief but sincere tribute to this man. I feel a special sense of loss at his passing—he was a personal friend and fellow Republican.

Walter Knott was a self-made man who exemplified the American ideal of success. He worked his way up from farmhand, to building contractor, berry farmer, businessman, and public servant. The trial was not easy; the Depression and Dust Bowl farming conditions provided fierce opposition, yet in the face of adversity, he continued to strive for success, and in time, attained his goal.

Mr. Knott began his public career relatively late in life, after the foundation of his multimillion-dollar tourist attraction, Knotts Berry Farm, had been secured. The early 1960's marked his entry into politics. He often spoke at the Americanism Educational League, an organization he strongly supported. Cohorts of Walter Knott began to introduce him as "Mr. Republican" throughout Orange County. And as a matter of fact, due to his reputation for honesty and reliability, Knott became a delegate to three Republican National Conventions. He served as National Finance Committee Chairman in 1964.

No one can deny that Walter Knott lived every minute of his life to the fullest. Aside from his political activism he was significantly involved in a wide variety of religious and philanthropic organizations. Nevertheless, he maintained a daily interest in the farm, writing letters, offering advice, even waiting in line with tourists for lunch each day, until both he and his wife began to suffer from ill health.

For all his success as an individual, a businessman, and politician—Walter Knott remained a modest man. He was a man fashioned from the humblest clay; yet a man with high spiritual values. He started a tradition, a business, and a tourist attraction—a selfless endeavor that clearly reflected his life of productivity and service to others.

To his family, we in the House extend our deepest sympathy and

share their fondest memories of a great American—Walter Knott.●

AMERICA'S MILITARY REVOLUTION

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, there is a quiet revolution going on in the Army and the Pentagon. One of its results will be a more secure America.

The revolution, reported by John Fialka in the Wall Street Journal article which follows, is intellectual. It is directed at changing the fighting concepts that guide doctrine, strategy, operations, and tactics, as well as equipment characteristics. Its objective is to make these diverse and complicated elements come together to form a coherent whole, an Army able to dominate the battlefield.

This is no small achievement. Historically, military institutions do not readily change their stripes. Indeed, they prefer to remain wedded to old, failed concepts until a battlefield catastrophe alerts them to the need for change.

Our Army is different. It has chosen to rethink and critically examine itself before disaster struck.

In a real sense it is a daring undertaking, and its success is owed to Generals Meyer, Starry, Otis, and Morelli. And its support in the Pentagon by Secretary of Defense Weinberger, Deputy Secretary of Defense Carlucci, and others is a tribute to an enlightened administration.

But what about the Congress? Have we missed the revolution? We face difficult decisions on military questions this spring. Are we up to speed on the developments that have gone on?

I would ask my colleagues to read the article by John Fialka and then find out more about this quiet yet remarkable revolution.

ARMY SHIFTS STRATEGY TO GIVE SMALL UNITS ROOM TO MANEUVER—IT BACKS FAST, FLEXIBLE ACTION OVER HEAVY FIREPOWER; LIKE SOCCER, NOT FOOTBALL

(By John J. Fialka)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Army is changing its basic combat doctrine, switching to a more intense, freewheeling style of warfare in which victory may hinge less on the firepower of mass formations and more on the abilities of small units to outmaneuver and confuse the enemy.

The Army is announcing the new doctrine to U.S. commanders in Europe and to NATO allies this month, and has already outlined it in secret briefings on Capitol Hill. Army officials describe the doctrine as a major "evolutionary" change from past reliance on achieving the superiority in weapons and equipment needed to halt large attacking enemy units.

The idea is that, if faced with a foe that is superior in conventional arms and likely to

use nuclear and chemical weapons, the Army would find battle lines becoming indistinct. Movement would have to be almost constant, and there would be little or no time for a commander to huddle with his subordinates.

"No longer will the outcome of battle be decided by attrition between lines drawn up as in a football game," says a blueprint called "Airland Battle 2000." Rather, it suggests, "Picture a soccer game as opposed to football. Each element maneuvering in what appears to be an independent, uncoordinated effort. In reality, it is a highly coordinated plan of action."

OUTSIDERS AMAZED

Critics in Congress and elsewhere, who have long attacked the Army for failing to teach doctrines based on maneuver, have been stunned by the change. "What you have here," one remarks, "is the first painful effort of a large organization that is trying to turn itself around." Edward Luttwak, a senior fellow of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, who for years has written articles criticizing the Army for hidebound ways, says he is startled to see "whole paragraphs" of his work showing up in the new doctrine.

The document called Airland Battle 2000 gives the basic ideas behind Army weapons, strategies and tactics for the next two decades. It has already had a major effect on the Army's 38 research laboratories. So far, 160 research programs have been steered toward longer-range goals, including the development of a family of fast, lightweight land vehicles and new electronic weapons systems.

As outlined by a senior official of the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, which prepared the plan, this is the Army's first coherent attempt to create a strategy that determines the development of future military hardware. "The concept of how you want to fight should drive technology and not vice versa," he says.

The basis of the Army doctrine, contained in a newly revised field-operations manual, is that "maneuver is the dynamic element of combat, the means . . . which enable small forces to defeat larger ones."

Or, as Airland Battle 2000 puts it, the Army is adopting "a style of waging war in which agility, deception, maneuver, and all other tools of combat are used to face the enemy with a succession of dangerous and unexpected situations more rapidly than he can react to them."

OPERATION CONFUSION

Previous Army doctrine tied victory directly to widespread destruction and big body counts. The new one says it is more attributable to enemy disorganization and confusion, to the loss of the adversary's "resolve to continue the fight."

The senior official at the Training and Doctrine Command, who declines to let his name be used, acknowledges that the new doctrine is borrowed in part from methods used for years by the West Germans and Israelis. He adds, however, that much of it is based on what the Army considers major U.S. advantages over the Soviet Union, including an edge in technology such as computers and miniaturized electronics and an inherently stronger "individualism" in the American soldier.

Some examples of what the Army plans or hopes to accomplish:

The basic unit of combat is to shift from the division (roughly 18,000 soldiers) to a

brigade (roughly 6,000) that controls artillery, communications and logistic units normally assigned to a division.

Field commanders will practice what the West German army calls "auftragstaktik," a style of command that encourages company and platoon leaders to innovate. Just how each unit would accomplish a given mission would be left to the captain or lieutenant on the scene.

A communications and intelligence-gathering system hardened against the hazards of nuclear, chemical and electronic warfare would give battle commanders an almost instantaneous view of the changing battlefield situation.

Research into electronic weapons systems and vehicle engines that don't rely on fossil fuels is to be accelerated, in an effort to increase firepower and reduce logistical burdens on combat units.

Closer tactical cooperation with the Air Force would focus air and missile strikes on enemy reinforcing units still two or three days away from the front.

High technology and automation, including robots, are to be used to offset manpower shortages caused by the lack of a draft and the long-term decline in the population of young men.

The Army has disappointed some military-reform enthusiasts by its continuing emphasis on expensive and often-fragile high technology. But the official of the Training and Doctrine Command maintains that some fancy hardware, such as expensive night-vision equipment, will be essential for quick-reacting, highly mobile units facing superior forces.

SEEING FARTHER

"Your stuff has to work when his doesn't," he says, adding that the new doctrine emphasizes the need for night attacks that give advantages to the attacker. The Airland Battle 2000 blueprint notes that "we must be able to see, analyze, decide and act faster than the enemy."

One impetus for the change in strategy was the frustration of the Army's chief of staff, Gen. Edward C. Meyer, and other officials over the seemingly interminable periods needed to develop and field new weapons. Both the new M1 tank and the M2 infantry fighting vehicle took almost two decades to develop because of industrial delays and frequent design changes.

Often Army planners have been unable to resist changes in weapons systems because there was no overall notion of how to fight in the future. And sometimes, in the process of frequent change, the original idea was simply lost.

"We wanted to work out a process so that we don't change our mind," and official explains, "to develop a disciplining consensus by finding out clearly how it is we want to fight. Once it's in the book, it's a little more difficult to change."

LASERS AND ROBOTS

Army planners who sat down last year to develop the new doctrine called in their laboratory scientists to consult on a wide spectrum of new technologies. The resulting goals, as described in Airland Battle 2000:

Lightweight, highly mobile vehicles that use the same power source for propulsion and for firing weapons. Among the possibilities are electrically powered vehicles and aircraft that use "directed energy" weapons such as lasers.

Sophisticated electronic systems that can disrupt enemy communications and that can mask U.S. operations by giving coherent

but false information to enemy radar and other sensors.

Computer-driven radio transmitters that can overcome enemy jamming by firing information in sudden, powerful bursts.

Robots that can repair vehicles, create pathways through enemy minefields and place mines behind enemy lines.

The Army's new doctrine has caused an unusual stir at the Pentagon. Deputy Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci, who has been trying to change the way the Pentagon plans and buys things, has praised Airland Battle 2000 and offered briefings on it for all of the assistant defense secretaries.

THE TWO ARMIES

The document also impresses a group in Congress that has urged a change in the Army's combat doctrine. "I like a lot of the words that are in there," says Republican Rep. Newt Gingrich of Georgia, a leader of this group. "I think we are in the middle of real change."

William S. Lind, a military historian who has worked closely with the congressional group, believes the Army's new plans have "some extremely positive elements" and reflect what he says is a great deal of enthusiasm among younger field officers for maneuver warfare.

But the continuing emphasis on expensive high technology, Mr. Lind warns, shows that the Army is "schizophrenic." He says: "There is the Army in the field, but then there is also the Washington Army, the hardware types. They care less about whether things work on the battlefield than whether they work bureaucratically."

Mr. Luttwak of Georgetown, for his part, finds fault with the Army's use of manpower. "If you want to be like the Israeli Seventh Brigade, which smashed 2½ divisions in the Golan Heights, then you need very high quality troops," he says. He notes that the Israeli army, relying on draftees, selects the best for fighting units. In the volunteer U.S. Army, he argues, the brightest soldiers often wind up in the rear, fixing high-technology equipment.

Overall, though, Mr. Luttwak is impressed with the change in doctrine. "What this means," he says, "is that today the real military reform movement is battling inside the Army and not just on the outside." ●

CHUNG DINH PHAM, NATIONAL WINNER IN THE MARCH FOR LIFE COMPETITION

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an essay written by a young man from Johnstown, Pa., who was the national overall winner among junior high school students in the 1982 March for Life essay, poetry, and poster competition.

Chung was present last week for the rally on the Ellipse during the ninth annual March for Life, and I had an opportunity to meet him and hear him read his essay to a delegation from the 12th Congressional District.

I certainly congratulate Chung on his essay and his interest in national

events. I enjoyed meeting him, and am glad to insert his essay into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STICK TO THE LIFE PRINCIPLES

(By Chung Pham)

I think abortion is something we should pray about. God gives each and everyone of us the gift of life. If we have life, then why can't the children that are killed have the chance to live, too? We, the living ones, should pray and ask God our Father to shine his light on this situation. To me, abortion is a very, very sad thing in America. I guess the reason is we have so much freedom, that we don't care what we do. There is right and wrong, and abortion is no doubt a wrong thing to do. Each year there are millions and millions of babies being killed. People are not taking this situation seriously. I think if abortion doesn't stop right now in America, then God will take the freedom away from us. Abortion translates to the word killing, and killing to Catholics is a serious sin.

You know, I wonder a lot about the parents and doctors that are truly killing these innocent children. I also wonder what God will say to these people on judgment day. We, the people of America, with our loving feelings, could help stop abortion through our prayers, and letters urging the Supreme Court to say that abortion is illegal. Who knows? Some day abortion will be illegal in America, and wouldn't it be great to see our nation as really the land of the free and the home of the brave?

To me the land of the free means we have freedom, and this freedom we have to use wisely. And the home of the brave means that we really want to do what is right and not be afraid to do it because God has blessed us. To me this situation could be handled by only one person, and that person is God, who is the giver of life.

And so, let us pray and ask God to help make our nation a great one, not just for a while then quit, but every day. I know, and the good people know, that God will grant us what we want if we really need it, and abortion will stop if we really love these children and want them to have life. God will someday grant us what we want, and that is the stopping of abortion. Life is for everyone, and life should be given to these children. ●

LT. COL. CHARLES RAY RECENT VICTIM OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, I was pleased to insert the eloquent remarks by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Thomas J. Welsh of Arlington, Va., concerning the crime against the unborn—abortion. Today, I am moved by the bishop's remarks of the crime against innocent men, women, and children—international terrorism. My sincere sympathy to the Ray family for the terrible loss of such a great lover of life, family, country, and God

as Lt. Col. Charles Ray. Members of this great House, let us in the name of our God and Lieutenant Colonel Ray, work with fervent resolve to eliminate international terrorists.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE MOST REVEREND THOMAS J. WELSH, BISHOP OF ARLINGTON, ON THE MURDER OF LT. COL. CHARLES RAY

It was with a great sense of loss that I heard of the assassination of Lt. Col. Charles Ray. The military family is stung by this wickedness that slayed a man who worked for peace. The family of Christ is horrified that such a senseless act killed a man who served his Church with love and brotherhood.

His dedication to his country was demonstrated by this service abroad. His love for his Church was seen in his many activities at St. Bernadette's in Springfield, and his concern was reinforced when he returned from Paris for the dedication of the new St. Bernadette's this past October. We looked forward to his return after his tour of duty so that he could continue his diaconate studies.

Yet is is through such heartbreak that God's grace touches us who are left to continue. Let us pray that we continue to work for justice and peace and especially remember to pray for those in the military and government foreign service who, though nameless to us, are working for the goals of freedom under the danger of international terrorists.●

SENIOR CITIZENS PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I received a very interesting letter from a constituent of mine who also happens to run the senior citizen programs for the town of Babylon. She offers some excellent suggestions, with which I fully and strongly agree, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

TOWN OF BABYLON,
January 18, 1982.

Congressman THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
West Islip, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOWNEY: During this time of economic crises facing our Nation, I realize that many difficult decisions must be faced. It is my sincere hope that you share my concern in regard to our Senior Citizens, the frail elderly and the shut-ins, particularly of the low or no income group.

I have received many calls from Babylon Town Senior Citizens, whose food stamps have been decreased from \$45 to \$15 per month. Other Seniors inform me that their income is too high to receive Social Services and yet they are forced to draw from their dwindling savings to survive.

Rents in Suffolk County are not controlled resulting in increased rents yearly and, in some instance, more frequently. Another serious complaint states that even if the Senior Citizens can afford a doctor, they cannot afford the medication.

On the basis of these face to face contacts with our elderly population, I urge you to

follow the White House 1981 Conference's advice to create major new programs, such as, National Health Insurance and tax incentives for families who provide a home for their elderly relatives.

I cannot overemphasize the following recommendations:

The right to economic well-being.

Social Security benefits should be adjusted to reflect increases in the cost of living twice a year instead of once.

Social Security Benefits paid to current recipients should not be reduced.

Older homeowners, if they wish, should be allowed to convert the equity in their houses into income while remaining in their houses.

The money cut from Federal spending for human services this year should be restored and strict standards of accountability should be applied to any increases in defense spending.

Both Medicare and Medicaid should be extended to cover home health care and services.

Federal, State and local governments should plan, finance, and facilitate the implementation of a continuum of services to meet the needs of the elderly including both those who live in the community and those who are institutionalized.

The Federal law that permits mandatory retirement (at age 70 or older) on the basis of age alone should be repealed.

Professional licensing authorities should require training in gerontology for doctors, nurses, therapists and pharmacists.

At least 200,000 housing units for the elderly should be provided through public and private programs.

Legislation should be enacted to convene a national conference in 1986 to review the status of the recommendations adopted at the 1981 White House Conference on Aging.

Let us strive to preserve the right to economic well-being for our Senior Population. I share my thoughts with you in the sincere hope that you will respond favorably to the Conference's recommendations.

Very truly yours,

MARGE BOYLAN,
Deputy Commissioner, Department of
Human Resources, Senior Citizen De-
partment.●

JASON: A SON AND PRINCE GEORGES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the numerous good aspects of living in Prince Georges County, Md., was brought to my attention recently in an article written by Mrs. Mary Edgerly. Her comments in praise of the special education program within the Prince Georges County school system was most apt; we are fortunate in having a nationally recognized program for the handicapped, and, in particular, for early identification of potential problems.

I commend Mrs. Edgerly for her moving article, which appeared in the Prince Georges Journal, and I include it here to share with my colleagues. I

am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that the kind of caring concern Mrs. Edgerly holds, not only for her family, but for her community is the vital link in forging a better society.

JASON: A SON AND PRINCE GEORGES
(By Mary Edgerly)

Recently, as I drove my son, Jason, to his weekly Toddler Group at the Glendale Center for Special Children, I tuned to DC 101 and Howard Stern. I had not previously heard his slurs on Prince George's County, nor had I read *The Journal's* response, but as this was the focal point of Mr. Stern's show that morning, I caught on pretty fast. Though I often find Stern's show funny, I didn't laugh at this. Prince George's County may have its problems, but I'm tired of people putting it down.

I wonder how many of the people knocking Prince George's have handicapped or learning-disabled children. I'd be willing to bet none of them do.

About 18 months ago, when I found out that my seven-month-old son was hemiplegic (partially paralyzed on one side), I was at a total loss at what to do. His doctors at Children's Hospital were kind and sympathetic, but they didn't have much time for my questions. Jason was enrolled in the hospital's physical therapy a week, the expenses began to add up, especially when my husband lost his job and the insurance policy it provided.

Up to this point, I had heard nothing of the Early Identification Program. I had lived in Prince George's all my life and attended public schools, and I didn't have any complaints. But when Jason's therapist described Early I.D. to me, I began to really appreciate my home county. Early Identification is so named because the earlier a problem is identified the earlier it can be treated and helped. The program is a part of the county school system and it is designed to help children with special needs in any way it can. It is staffed with physical, occupational, and speech therapists as well as special educational teachers. Until Children's Hospital brought us together, I didn't even know such a program existed. I wish now that everyone knew about it.

There was a short waiting period before Jason was picked up by Early I.D. (They, like Children's Hospital, have a too-large caseload.) Until I was visited by an Early I.D. representative, I didn't realize the scope of the program. Jason was evaluated, and it was decided that he would continue with therapy for an hour each week (with me following through at home). As a bonus, he would be seen by a special education teacher once a week. These people would come to our home. There would be no more bundling up, buckling Jason in the car seat, and parking fees each week. And all this would be at no cost to me.

I was a little apprehensive about taking Jason out of the hospital program and putting him into Early I.D. After all, I knew Children's to be an excellent hospital. I liked Jason's therapist. Would the Early I.D. personnel be as well-trained?

As it turned out, I needn't have worried. Jason's first special education teacher went to high school with my sister and had grown up in my neighborhood. Right away, she seemed like a friend. I could tell immediately, that she enjoyed children, and Jason warmed up to her quickly. Best of all, after a few visits, she was able to assure me that

mentally Jason was in the normal range. The doctors at Children's had said we would have to wait and see. They didn't have time (and I certainly didn't have the money) to sit down and test and evaluate my son. Jason's teacher eased my mind, and that was worth a lot.

Jason has had several physical therapists since entering the program, and all have been well-qualified and patient. They have all shown a true liking for children. Jason doesn't enjoy his therapy, but he has come to trust his various therapists. That, too, is worth a lot.

Since October of this year, Jason has been enrolled in the toddler group at Glendale Center. There he is met by several little friends with special needs and two cheerful competent teachers. He enjoys the group setting, but also has individual time with his assigned teacher periodically. I hope this experience will help Jason in the future to be self-confident in spite of his handicap.

Next year, when he is 3, Jason will be picked up on a bus daily and driven to school for a half-day. There he will get physical therapy, as well as speech or occupational therapy should he need it. In addition, of course, there will be a regular school curriculum for pre-schoolers. After age 5, as soon as he is able, he will be mainstreamed into public school.

Though they have enough to do caring for the children enrolled in their program, Early I.D. hasn't forgotten about me. They send out a bi-monthly newsletter and have parent meetings at different times through the month. Every other week while Jason is in his toddler group, I go to one of these support groups. Just talking with parents of other special-needs children makes my life a little easier. The conductor of the group has a talent for bringing us out of our shells, and she makes sure we have access to any literature which might help us. Jason's doctors don't have time for this type of attention, and no one can blame them. I'm just glad I live in a county where someone does have time.

Not long ago, my husband and I thought of moving to be closer to his new job. We called several counties in the area and could find only one in Virginia that could compare to Prince George's County in the area of special education. Needless to say, we're staying here. Jason's welfare is worth that 45-minute trip to work.

I don't know about Howard Stern, but I think I can speak for many other parents and special children when I say:

I'm glad I live in Prince George's.

FOR 2,500 FAMILIES, THE ORDEAL CONTINUES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to remember the day 9 years ago when the leaders of our Nation signed the Paris Peace accords which brought to a formal end the military conflict in Vietnam and provided the 2,500 families of missing Americans in Southeast Asia with the hope that their loved ones would finally be returned. In fact, article 8 of the peace accords specifically dealt with

the procedures for returning the Americans who were killed in action or were being held as prisoners of war.

Unfortunately, while we have lived up to our responsibilities outlined in the peace accords, the leaders of Vietnam have chosen to ignore their part of the peace agreement. They have also failed to demonstrate any desire to act in a moral and humane fashion in this matter.

For this reason, the United States has not resumed diplomatic relations with Vietnam, and we have publicly stated that we will not normalize relations until we receive a full accounting of all Americans.

Despite Vietnam's lack of cooperation, we have continued to do all that we can to account for our countrymen. The Department of Defense has placed a priority on the investigation of any sighting reports we receive. In addition, efforts to account for the POW's and MIA's have received the full support of President Reagan and this body.

As a response to Vietnam's lack of cooperation in the accounting procedure, many of you supported my amendment to the foreign aid bill 6 years ago to stop all direct and indirect United States aid from going to Vietnam. We have also established a task force on American prisoners and missing in Southeast Asia to monitor developments in Vietnam and we have designated specific days to call attention to the continuing ordeal of the families of the missing Americans. My colleague from California, Mr. DORNAN, today introduced legislation, which I am cosponsoring, to designate July 9, 1982, as National POW-MIA Recognition Day.

Even though we set aside special days to pay tribute to the continuing courage of these families, we must keep the missing Americans in our prayers each day. It is my hope that someday soon our prayers will be answered so that these families can at last learn the fate of their loved ones.

HOPE IN FARM EXPORTS

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, although the news from farm country is dismal, at best, I did recently come across an article which highlights the one potential bright spot on the agricultural scene, and that is farm exports. Our agricultural exports contribute almost \$50 billion annually to lessening the U.S. balance-of-trade deficit, and that figure is projected to continue to increase in future years. It is vitally important, though, that this

Nation make a firm and unequivocal determination regarding the policy which we are going to pursue in the area of food exports. For too long now we have tried to have it both ways; we say we are following a free market approach to agricultural exports, and yet we threaten our trading partners with embargoes and suspensions of trade. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this Nation are no less patriotic than any other sector, but they cannot continue to live with this equivocal policy and its attendant depressing effect on grain markets. We can live with either approach, but we cannot live with both. Let us make a determination, enunciate it clearly to friend and foe alike, and then stick to that policy.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

[From the Beatrice (Nebr.) Daily Sun, Nov. 24, 1981]

HOPE IN FARM EXPORTS

(By Kent Thomas)

Not all of the farm news is bad this Thanksgiving week, at least for farmers who can afford to be patient.

Granted, the compromise farm bill before Congress is a disappointment to most farmers; and prices paid farmers for their produce are unrealistically low—even disastrous for some.

But the long-term picture provides some light at the end of the tunnel, according to Secretary of Agriculture John Block.

In a hearing before a House of Representatives trade subcommittee, Block gave a hopeful picture about the growth of farm exports. He said the long-term, sustained growth in farm exports is the Administration's No. 1 priority for U.S. agriculture.

"Our price-support proposals are mindful of the need to protect farmers against economic disaster," he said, "but they also recognize agriculture's need to be competitive in an expanding and increasingly competitive world market."

Block said for fiscal 1981, exports are expected to be \$48 billion, a 10 percent increase over fiscal 1980. Exports in fiscal 1982 are projected by the Department of Agriculture to be from \$44 billion to \$48 billion.

Block illustrated how exports play a larger role than they did 10 years ago:

In 1971, exports accounted for less than 40 percent of U.S. wheat production. In 1981, almost 70 percent of the U.S. wheat output will be exported.

The world market now provides an outlet for one-third of the U.S. corn harvest, three times the export share in 1971-72.

Half of U.S. soybean production is exported.

"We are at the point where farmers use almost 40 percent of their cropland to produce for export, and they have come to depend on export for one-fourth of their marketing income," Block said.

Block expects an increased demand for U.S. farm exports in the 1980s.

"Foreign food demand is likely to continue to expand at a near record of 2.5 percent to 2.7 percent in volume a year in the 1980s," he said. "At the same time, sharply rising production costs and increased use of marginal land are expected to slow increases in foreign food output from 2.1 percent to 2.4 percent per year."

"Given this supply and demand situation, purchases of food, feed and fiber by other countries will continue to increase."

This emphasis on farm exports, provided it continues, is not only important but necessary for agriculture and the nation's total economic well-being. After all, if it weren't for our favorable trade balance in agriculture (\$27 billion in fiscal 1981) our country would really be in a mess. It appears the non-ag trade deficit will approximate \$50 billion or more this year. Locally, we already know about the heavy impact of agriculture; the dramatic contrast in trade balance figures should tell the nation at large how important agriculture is, too.●

TIME TO CRACK DOWN ON DRUNK DRIVERS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following piece that was printed in the Washington Post recently. It cites the experience in California where new, stiff drunk driving laws cut down on traffic fatalities over the Christmas holidays.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland, Michael Barnes, has introduced a bill, which I have cosponsored, providing for a comprehensive alcohol-traffic safety program. H.R. 2488 would require States to adopt mandatory drunk-driving enforcement programs—or forego Federal transportation aid. I hope more Members of Congress will join us in this nationwide campaign.

It is unfortunate and unacceptable that the same society that condemned the bloodshed in Southeast Asia seemingly turns its back on the bloodshed here in America and does nothing to penalize those who mercilessly take the lives of 26,000 innocent citizens a year and who injure a million more.

We, who value life and respect it, must take immediate steps to stop this needless slaughter. Thankfully, more and more people across America are shaking off their lethargy and are pushing efforts to get the drunk driver off the road at the local level and in Congress.

In Kentucky, Gov. John Y. Brown has announced he will be submitting proposals to the 1982 general assembly to stiffen the penalties against drunk drivers. Four Kentucky legislators have already introduced antidrunk driver proposals of their own.

But, crackdowns in just a few States won't do the trick. Drunk driving is a nationwide epidemic—and needs a nationwide cure.

The problem of the drunk driver is a problem for us all. Not only do the families and friends of the innocent suffer, but all society is the worse for the thoughtless loss of life and proper-

ty. The fabric of our society is shredded each time this senseless killing occurs.

I, for one, believe it's time to say, "no more."

DEATHS DROP AFTER CALIFORNIA STIFFENS DRUNKEN DRIVING LAWS

(By Jay Mathews)

LOS ANGELES.—California officials reported today one of the first significant results of a national citizen's campaign against intoxicated drivers—a 43 percent drop in New Year's holiday traffic deaths in the state as stringent new drunken driving laws went into effect.

Federal and state officials said the new package of California laws, which took effect at midnight Thursday, appears to have brought about a new caution in many drivers. They said the development may help accelerate a stiffening throughout the country of laws against drunken driving, which was involved in an estimated half of the 51,000 U.S. traffic deaths in 1980.

California Highway Patrol spokesman Ernest J. Garcia said the drop in traffic deaths from 47 a year ago to 27 in the three-day holiday period—the lowest New Year's death toll in 20 years—appears to be the direct result of the changes in state law and widespread publicity about them. There was so much preliminary news coverage warning of the new laws, which include mandatory jail terms and license suspensions, that Christmas holiday traffic deaths also dropped sharply, from 64 to 31, Garcia said.

"I've talked to many people, both as an officer and a citizen," Garcia said. "Most people say, 'The law has teeth now; it looks like you can't get off with a fine or going to school. This might mean a jail term and I don't want to go to jail.'"

Al Lauersdorf, a spokesman for the National Safety Council in Chicago, said bad weather and the poor economy also may have helped cut the highway death rate in recent months, but the citizen campaign against drunken driving was crucial and produced more concern about the issue than he had seen in 15 years in traffic safety work.

Month-by-month figures provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration show traffic deaths across the nation from 1 to 11 percent below 1980 levels from May through November.

The impact of the new California laws is particularly significant because the state has been the base of one of the most active citizen groups, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD). The group's leader, Candy Lightner, began a concerted lobbying effort in Sacramento, now expanded to about a dozen other states, including Maryland and Virginia, after her 13-year-old daughter was struck and fatally injured by a car whose driver had been drinking.

Efforts to toughen drunken driving penalties have been resisted in the past by judges who feel mandatory sentences are too inflexible, by prosecutors who feel juries would be unwilling to impose them and by defense attorneys who argue that such laws would just make jails more crowded and hurt rehabilitation efforts. Citizen lobbying last year, however, resulted in California's unusually tough laws and in less far-reaching changes in other states, including Maryland, where the blood alcohol level requirements have been stiffened.

Law enforcement efforts also have been increased, as in Maryland, where roadblocks were set up to check drivers during the New Year's holiday.

John Moulden, a research psychologist for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, said the role of citizen groups like MADD and Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID) "has been absolutely critical." Moulden said the initial California results show drivers responding to the threat of penalties, but he advised a close look at how rigorously judges and prosecutors apply the laws when cases begin to come to court in two weeks.

Reducing drunken driving, Moulden said, "appears to be a political and not a technical problem." Most states have harsh penalties on their books that are rarely invoked, he said.

Many of the changes in California law involve subtle distinctions and technicalities such as a new statute making a .10 percent blood alcohol level absolute evidence, and not just a presumption, that the driver is under the influence of alcohol. Maryland last year also stiffened its blood alcohol level requirements, resulting in a sharp increase in arrests for drunken driving. But Maryland, Virginia and the District have not yet instituted the kind of penalties for drunken drivers now in effect in California.

But MADD chapters are working on it. Susan Midgett of Norfolk, the Virginia state representative for MADD, said her group is pushing for law changes that will be "a whole lot" like those California has, "except there are a lot of loopholes here we also want to plug." Maryland's MADD chapter is headed by Tom and Dorothy Sexton of Bowie.

Under the new California law, every conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol requires a jail sentence of at least 48 hours, with one exception. If the case is a misdemeanor first offense, the judge may substitute a fine, require attendance at drinking drivers' school and a 90-day license suspension including permission to drive only to and from work.

A mandatory minimum fine of \$375 for every driving-under-the-influence conviction has been instituted, and \$20 of each fine will be directed to a victims' indemnity fund to help pay accident damages.

On a second drunken driving conviction, a judge may require the driver to attend an alcoholic treatment program for one year and add further jail time if he or she fails to attend. If a judge dismisses a drunken driving charge or reduces one to a lesser offense, he must read into the record his reasons for doing so, and this summary must remain on his personal record, the California law provides.●

MISSING IN ACTION

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our 10th year since the signing of the Paris peace accords, I have more hope that an honorable resolution will be reached regarding the 2,500 heroic men who have not been accounted for in Indochina. It is my hope that live heroes will be returned to their beloved country to which they devoted their lives.

I would like to draw my colleague's attention to a letter I received from Patricia O'Grady Aloat, whose father, Maj. John Francis O'Grady, is 1 of the 2,500 men who has not returned to this great Nation to which he devoted his life. The letter follows:

The sky was rimmed with a violet hue. Dawn broke quietly over the Nevada desert as my father entered my room for the last time. He was tall and impressive in his navy uniform, but his gray eyes were misty with tears. "Don't worry," he said. "I'll be back when summer's in the meadow." I smiled at the familiar words from his favorite song. Then, he gently kissed my sister and I good-bye. Striding out of our bedroom, he told us to stay in bed. But the moment his last suitcase was stowed in the family car and the front door squeaked closed, seven sleepy children raced to the window to wave their goodbyes. We never saw our father again.

Not only did he never come back to us, but more tragically, he never came back to his country. And, living with that knowledge rekindles my grief. My father was a good and kind man who served his country well even though it must have been difficult for such a gentle, intelligent person. Yet, despite his commitment to his country, his fate and the fate of thousands of others has been ignored by our leaders and erased from our national conscience.

Time and tears have helped heal my personal sorrow and the throbbing hurt of my loss. Yet, the neglect of my father's memory remains a piercing pain and denies me my heritage. As the oldest child and on behalf of my siblings, I need to know if my father lives or how he died on that long ago day in April. I need to welcome him with open arms or carry flowers to his grave. I need to know that he lies sleeping in a comfortable bed or in a peaceful, hallowed ground. The answers to these questions have haunted me for more than half the days of my life.

The key is out there somewhere to open the door to this agonizing problem. It requires an intensive focus on this issue by the executive branch, the elected representatives of the people and by the people themselves. Obviously, a major role will have to be played by the American press, in alerting the public to this humanitarian problem which has been unresolved for too long. It is my hope that 1982 will mark the resolution of this page in a tragic chapter of American history with the full and complete accounting of these brave people and the end of the suffering for them, their families, and all other concerned citizens. ●

NICARAGUA RECEIVES LOAN FROM PLO

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if the old saying is true that "we are known by the friends we keep," then it is indeed interesting to learn that the Palestine Liberation Organization loaned the Sandinista Government of

Nicaragua about 6 million pounds or something just short of \$12 million recently. Actually, the PLO is more like a big corporation in its financing rather than a struggling guerrilla group. Therefore, I commend this very interesting item to the attention of my colleagues that appeared in the Daily Telegraph (London) of December 2, 1981.

NICARAGUANS GET \$6M LOAN FROM AFFLUENT PLO

(By John Bulloch)

The Palestine Liberation Organisation has lent \$6,000,000 to the Sandinista Government in Nicaragua to give new weight to the PLO's boast that it is the "richest liberation organisation in the world."

According to financiers in Beirut the PLO now has a "legal" income of at least \$125 million a year. Most of this comes from direct grants from Arab states and from taxes paid by Palestinians working in the Gulf.

These Palestinians have between three and five percent of their wages deducted at source.

But an increasingly important part of the PLO finance comes from investments, and because some of these investments are in countries and companies which would be considered "enemies of the Palestine Revolution" all details are kept strictly secret.

In Beirut, with its 80 different banking houses and hundreds of fringe finance organisations, money matters are hard to conceal, however, and it is known that the PLO's "official" income is at least matched by the money it receives from other sources—investment income and "under-the-counter" grants.

POLITICAL INVESTMENTS

It is the Arab Bank, based in Amman, which handles the bulk of PLO income, with experts from the Kuwait Investment Corporation advising where surplus funds should be placed.

They are said to give their advice on purely financial criteria. But the Palestine National Fund, under the chairmanship of Mr. Salah Dabbagh, and after consultations with the 15-member Executive Council of the PLO under Yasser Arafat, often decides on "political" investments.

Thus a Belgian air-charter firm is largely owned by the PLO so that its planes can transport arms.

Two hotels in Beirut have been bought to provide secure accommodation for important guests.

A medical supply company in France is largely PLO-owned, and so are a discotheque in Rome and a chicken farm in Syria.

In addition the "Samed" organisation, set up to provide work for disabled, old or destitute former members of the organisation, is now making a profit.

Samed ("steadfast" in Arabic) runs small workshops making clothes, furniture, or handicrafts, and employs more than 3,000 people.

ARMS PROVIDED FREE

Not all the revenue is used to fuel the PLO's war machine. The amount spent on arms is relatively small, as most weaponry is provided free by countries such as Libya, Syria, or Iraq.

The relatively generous and effective system of pensions for dependants of PLO men killed in action or disabled is a major drain on funds.

So, too, is the Palestine Red Crescent, which runs 800-bed hospitals in Lebanon and more than 20 clinics, and employs some 300 doctors, not all of them Palestinian.

The 100 PLO offices around the world, the "embassies" of the movement, have to be staffed, and the accommodation has to be paid for.

And (a major item) the regular Palestinian "fighters" have to be paid, as well as the leaders of the movement and the considerable bureaucracy.

So complicated has it all become that Yasser Arafat called in a business consultant, Dr. Banil Shaath, a professor at the American University of Beirut, to advise on streamlining the system.

The professor reported there was "very little" corruption in the administration of the huge funds, though at one time some officials were found to have been gambling with embezzled funds. ●

OUR FRIENDS IN TAIWAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 gives the full force of law to the American commitment to supply adequate defensive weapons to the Republic of China. As a major trading partner of the United States, Taiwan is a strategically located island. Its survival as a prosperous, viable nation is of obvious importance to the United States.

The subject of providing modern defensive fighter aircraft to the Republic of China on Taiwan was addressed in a very timely and effective editorial which appeared in the *Aurora, Ill. Beacon-News* of January 11. As this is an issue to which I completely subscribe, I wish to insert it into the *RECORD* for the Members' review:

[From the *Beacon-News*, Jan. 11, 1982]

U.S. CAN'T FORGET FRIENDS IN TAIWAN

The Chinese Nationalist government on Taiwan has been pressing Washington for permission to purchase advanced fighter aircraft since 1979. Predictably, the prospective sale has long since assumed a significance that is more political than military.

Taiwan desires a new arms deal with the United States partly as a tangible symbol of Washington's continued solicitude for the freedom and security of 18 million Chinese who have no desire to be swallowed by the Communist mainland. Peking officials, of course, oppose anything that would strengthen Taiwan's resistance to eventual assimilation, whether by persuasion, intimidation, or the outright use of force.

The Carter administration and its successor under President Reagan, caught between conflicting pressures to preserve Taiwan's security and to improve relations with The People's Republic of China, repeatedly postponed a decision. The only signal sent to either Taiwan or Peking was one of vacillation, hardly a posture that could instill respect for American foreign policy.

The time has come, we think, for Washington to reach a decision, political consider-

ations aside, Taiwan has a demonstrable need for new fighters to replace the aging F-5As and F-100s that now are the mainstays of the island's air defenses.

From Washington's standpoint, the ideal replacements would be the new F-5Es and F-5Gs that would significantly strengthen Taiwan's air defense without posing even a symbolic threat to mainland China. Although Taiwan wants the more advanced F-16, the modernized F-5 models designed specifically for export to U.S. allies with limited defense budgets would be both acceptable and appropriate.

The sale of F-5Es and even an agreement permitting Taiwan to manufacture F-5Gs under license would be fully consistent with the security ties spelled out in the U.S.-Taiwan Relations Act, approved by Congress following the establishment of full diplomatic relations with Peking in 1979.

China will continue to oppose any sale of U.S. arms to Taiwan and may even threaten to cool its rapprochement with Washington. But China's leaders know what American policymakers ought to recognize as well: That the Sino-American courtship is based almost exclusively on mutual distrust of the Soviet Union.

Selling strictly defensive aircraft to Taiwan won't alter the superpower equation that has pushed China toward cooperation with the United States. What an appropriate U.S.-Taiwan arms agreement would do is demonstrate to anxious American allies in Asia and elsewhere that Washington doesn't forget its friends. That is the kind of signal that even Peking may someday come to appreciate. ●

THE JOB OF REDUCING THE DEFICIT

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon begin the process of shaping the Federal budget for fiscal year 1983. This morning's Washington Post carries a story in which administration sources are reported as saying that the budget deficit for fiscal year 1982 will be a record one, slightly under \$100 billion. While the President's formal budget message will not be transmitted to us until February 8, 1982, the same news story suggests that the fiscal year 1983 deficit will be more than \$90 billion.

These levels of deficit spending are simply unacceptable, if we are to chart a course of economic recovery. The task of reducing these deficits falls to the Congress in general, and the House of Representatives in particular as the House of Congress charged with originating money legislation by the Constitution.

On Monday, January 25, 1982, in a special order commencing at page H10 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I addressed myself, in detail, to the economics of deficit spending. I quoted from a January 19, 1982, op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal by Martin

Feldstein, professor of economics at Harvard and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Mr. Feldstein's article carries the headline, "The Job of Reducing the Deficit." It is an excellent statement, and while I would dissent from the conclusion that the 1983 installment of the individual tax-rate reduction should be postponed, on balance the article is worthy of our careful consideration.

The full text of the article is as follows:

THE JOB OF REDUCING THE FEDERAL DEFICIT (By Martin Feldstein)

Speculating about the President's reaction to the budget advice of his economic counselors is such an absorbing activity that it's easy to forget that the administration's proposals are only the first step in the budget process. Congress will ultimately determine the shape of the budget for 1983 and beyond. Because both taxes and spending are in transition, it is particularly important that Congress make its budget decision as part of a long-term strategy.

The immediate focus in Congress will be on controlling the federal deficit. Only a few months ago, the administration shocked many people by acknowledging that tax rules and spending patterns imply a 1984 deficit of \$160 billion. Such a deficit would be about 4 percent of 1984's \$4 trillion gross national product, or about twice the rate of fiscal 1981. How did the prospective deficit get so large? And what will be done to reduce it?

It would be wrong to say that the 1984 deficit figure is due to a massive cut in personal tax rates. The 25 percent reduction that Congress enacted will be just about enough to prevent bracket creep from raising the share of income that is taken in taxes. It would also be wrong to say that the prospective deficit is due to a major rise in defense spending since the 7 percent a year real increase that the President has called for would raise defense spending only from 5.5 percent of GNP in 1980 to 6.5 percent in 1984.

ROOTS OF THE DEFICIT

The main reason that the prospective 1984 deficit is 4 percent of GNP is that the administration inherited a deficit that had grown over the past decade to 2 percent of GNP. The increase in defense spending over four years will add an additional 1 percent of GNP to the 1984 deficit. The business tax reductions (primarily the accelerated cost recovery system) and the personal tax cuts (including the bracket reductions, the saving incentives and the end of the marriage penalty) each increase the 1984 deficit by about 0.75 percent of GNP. Offsetting these increases are the spending cuts enacted in 1981 that, by 1984, will reduce outlays by about 0.5 percent of GNP. Combining the inherited deficit with these changes in taxes and spending implies a 1984 deficit of 4 percent of GNP, or \$160 billion.

Some analysts have overreacted to this figure, saying that such deficits would cause financial chaos. Some administration spokesmen and their outside friends have overreacted in the opposite direction and said such deficits don't matter. Neither extreme position is correct. Large deficits in 1983 and beyond wouldn't cause financial chaos but they would be a very serious economic problem.

Continued deficits put pressure on product markets that makes prices increase

faster than they otherwise would. Though the Fed may be able to prevent a significant rise in inflation by allowing high real interest rates to crowd out private spending, large deficits surely put the Fed's monetarist determination to a severe test. Moreover, such a policy could strain Congress' tolerance of high interest rates to the point where it forces the Fed back to the inflationary accommodation policies of the past decade.

But even if their inflationary effect is small, sustained deficits would be pernicious by crowding out private investment. In recent years, net private investment has been only 6 percent of gross national product. A rise of the deficit by another 2 percent of GNP could reduce net private investment by one-third of its current value to just 4 percent of GNP.

Of course the tax incentives enacted this year may raise total saving and increase the flow of saving into business investment by enough to permit the government deficit to rise substantially without reducing the current ratio of business investment to GNP. But even if that occurs, it wouldn't change the fact that the deficit would have prevented the increased capital formation that would otherwise have occurred.

It would surely be unfortunate if the important new tax incentives for saving and investment serve only to prevent our rate of investment from becoming lower than it has been in recent years.

What then should be done to decrease the deficit? The key is reducing federal nondefense spending. The overgrowth of government spending that has occurred in the past two decades would deserve substantial pruning even if there were no deficit. Much of the increase in government spending during these years has been due to the introduction and expansion of programs that are wasteful and are the source of serious distortions in economic incentives.

The issue is whether Congress and the administration will have the political fortitude to make the necessary legislative changes, especially in Social Security and the other "entitlement" or cash-transfer programs. Every proposed spending cut brings howls from those who would lose benefits and from the industries and professional groups that serve them. Moreover, the status quo acquires such an appearance of legitimacy that many others also rush to defend every existing program. But this plethora of programs cannot be legitimized by reference to their history.

Anyone contemplating the possibility of major reductions in government spending should recognize just how recently many of the spending programs were created or expanded. In 1960, federal civilian spending accounted for 9 percent of gross national product. That increased to 13 percent by 1970 and to 17 percent by 1980. Returning such spending to 1970's share of GNP—hardly back to the Dark Ages in terms of economic and social spending would reduce outlays by 4 percent of GNP or \$160 billion at the 1984 level, enough to eliminate the entire deficit.

Though such a reduction of the federal government's share in GNP will not occur by 1984, it could be achieved over a somewhat longer period. If the growth of federal civilian spending were slowed to 2 percent less than the inflation rate, the share of such spending would be reduced to 1970's 13 percent in less than six years. Slowing the growth of spending in this way would obviously be politically difficult. But the exist-

ing legislative commitment to future tax cuts and the justifiable dislike of budget deficits may together provide the political pressure that Congress needs to enact this spending slowdown.

Canceling the personal tax cuts or increasing other taxes at the present time would reduce this pressure on Congress and thereby make it more difficult to achieve desirable cuts in government spending. Nevertheless, the failure to raise taxes implies larger deficits in the next few years and therefore more undesirable crowding out of private investment. How should this dilemma be resolved?

It is clear that if Congress is never going to get the spending share down to match the tax revenue that current tax rules imply, the tax rules must be changed to provide more revenue. Repealing the 1983 tax cut of 10 percent would add 1984 revenue of about \$40 billion or 1 percent of GNP as a permanent tax increase. Similarly, the changes in excise taxes and other tax rules that the administration has discussed could permanently add some \$30 billion to future tax revenue.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the administration and Congress will lack the courage to control the growth of spending. Making such an assumption and therefore voting a permanent tax increase now would, by reducing the political pressure that a prospective deficit provides, make it more difficult for Congress to continue to slow the growth of spending.

My preference would therefore be to avoid a permanent tax increase but to obtain a temporary increase in tax revenue by stretching out the personal tax cut. For example, the 10 percent rate cut scheduled for July 1983 could be postponed until July 1984 or even divided between 1984 and 1985. Such a stretch-out would reduce the crowding out of investment during the next few years while the spending reductions bring total outlays into line with the tax structure.

BRACKET INDEXING VITAL

It is crucial for Congress to remain committed to both the series of personal tax rate cuts and the bracket indexing that together will keep the tax share from being increased by inflationary bracket creep. Because bracket indexing is scheduled to begin only in 1985 and is still not widely understood, it is vulnerable to the political pursuit of additional tax revenue. The abandonment of bracket indexing would virtually guarantee a return to spiraling increases in taxes and government spending.

Any extra tax receipts that result from raising excise tax rates or from other changes in tax rules should be only a temporary revenue increase designed to limit crowding out during transition to a lower government-spending level. It would be appropriate therefore for Congress to vote in 1982 to return any such revenue in future years by gradually increasing the \$2,000 IRA deduction limit or by making other tax changes designed to encourage saving.

In short, the legitimate fear of a permanent deficit cannot justify a reversal of the 1981 tax cuts or a permanent increase in taxes from other sources. Even more important, a desire to eliminate the deficit should not be used as a rationale for undoing the structural tax changes that were enacted to stimulate saving and business investment. If that were to happen, the favorable long-term consequences of the 1981 tax changes would be destroyed.●

THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent struggles in Poland have sharply reminded Americans how dear and fragile our basic human freedoms are. Today, we have set aside a few moments to remember the Ukraine, another Eastern European nation that has been subject to Soviet hegemony.

Sixty-four years ago, the Ukrainian National Republic was established in the wake of the collapse of Czarist Russia. The Bolsheviks who later seized power in Russia proved to be as imperialistic as their predecessors and soon imposed their will on the Ukrainian people. Soviet domination over this, the largest of all non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe, endures to this day.

It is a great tribute to the Ukrainian people that their rich culture and heritage has not died. For 60 years, they have faced the challenge of maintaining their national identity and pride even as their conquerors have sought to destroy all non-Russian nationalism. They have met the challenge admirably.

For many months now, the world has watched uneasily to see if the Soviets would intervene militarily to end the struggle for freedom in Poland. America prays that they will not; however that option remains open to Moscow. But the lesson of the Ukraine tells us that no amount of military might will ever crush the spirit of a people. Today, we salute the Ukrainian people and hope that their brave example will serve to inspire all people worldwide who strive for freedom of self-determination.●

THE STATE OF THE UNION

HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I think the President did a splendid job in delivering his state of the Union address, but most importantly there was a great deal of substance and a great deal of hope for the American people.

His call for a "New Federalism" is a bold new concept that fundamentally realines the responsibilities of government at the State and Federal level, and one that balances those responsibilities. Of special importance to State and local governments is the fact that

President Reagan has coupled their new responsibilities with the funding necessary for them to accomplish the job. I believe this realistic approach will result in improved services for people across America.

I was pleased to see that a number of ideas some of my colleagues and I have been suggesting to the President over the past weeks were included in the state of the Union address, including continuation of Federal responsibility and adequate funding for such vital programs for people as Head Start and education for the handicapped.

The President also addressed the present, the here-and-now problems of the economy and the need to continue with the broad, overall thrust of his comprehensive economic program.

It is essential not to retreat. To retreat now would send precisely the wrong signal in our country and throughout the world. We must continue our fight against inflation and redouble our efforts to reduce unemployment, bring down interest rates, and narrow the Federal deficit.

It is encouraging to note that the President believes, as I do, that this program must be equitable. Only if all of us perceive that we are bearing our fair share of the responsibility of fighting unemployment, high interest rates, and inflation will the plan continue to have the support of the American people. The minimum tax for large corporations the President mentioned in his speech is a significant step in closing tax loopholes and insuring tax equity.

Along these same lines, tax laws that unfairly benefit any one group over another must be eliminated. Accordingly, I strongly disapprove of recent Internal Revenue Service rulings that will permit Members of Congress to deduct what many taxpayers would consider unreasonable and unwarranted amounts from their taxable income without any sort of verification. I have written the IRS to express opposition to these recently issued regulations, and personally intend to continue to deduct only those expenses I actually incur. I include the letter at this point in the RECORD.

JANUARY 22, 1982.

HON. ROSCOE L. EGGER,
Commissioner,
Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: All agencies and departments of the federal government, including the I.R.S., must join in our efforts to narrow the federal budget deficit.

Congress especially must set an example and show leadership in our vital plans to achieve economic recovery. Like everybody else, reasonable tax deductions for expenses incurred on the job should be permitted for Members of Congress. However, the tax deduction regulations the I.R.S. issued last week create the potential for abuse and run counter to our efforts to be fair and equita-

ble in achieving economic recovery. The possibility that, under this new plan, a member of Congress could deduct up to \$75.00 a day would demonstrate extremely poor leadership. I firmly oppose these regulations.

I, for one, intend to deduct only those expenses actually incurred, and will reject the loopholes created by the recent I.R.S. regulations.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

THOMAS B. EVANS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Members of Congress should not be discriminated against by our tax policies, but neither should they unfairly benefit from them.

We have made remarkable achievements in less than a year, but as the President told the Nation last evening, much remains to be done. There are no magic formulas or overnight solutions for the problems that have been developing over decades. We must continue to change the direction of government, but we must work toward this goal with constant recognition of the real and present needs of Americans all across the country. ●

GONE BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago today, Washington experienced a day of tragedies. While many felt shock and sadness for the events of that day, my grief was of a more personal nature. A long-time friend and staff member, Barbara Miller, lost her husband, Richard, in the airplane crash that claimed 78 lives.

Although Rich was only 37 years old, one could never accuse him of sitting back while life moved by. From his childhood as one of four children, to his University of Maryland college career, to his marriage to Barbara, to his heroic return from Vietnam, to his life as father and husband, Rich remained a gentle man of humor, wisdom, and compassion.

While we will never forget the circumstances that brought his life to a tragic halt, we will remember Rich for what he gave us. To Barbara—the love and courage to carry on in his absence. To Jennifer, his 5-year-old daughter—the love and hope for a bright and successful future. To Brian, his 3-year-old son—the love and zest for life his father always displayed. To family and friends—the love and strength he so freely shared. We will miss Rich and the joy he brought to our lives but we will not forget him. ●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in marking the observance of the 64th anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine.

This year's remembrance of Ukraine's short-lived experience as a sovereign nation is especially poignant in the wake of the imposition of Soviet-induced martial law in Poland and the continuing Soviet aggression in Afghanistan.

Events in Afghanistan and Poland during the 1980's provide the free world with grim reminders that the Russian bear which swallowed up Ukraine more than six decades ago has not changed its aggressive or acquisitive nature.

The bear still has claws and still will use them when it suits its purposes.

The Russian invasion of Afghanistan reminded us that the fledgling Communist rulers of the 1920's and the aging Soviet leaders of the 1980's share the same continuing interest in expanding their imperial borders.

The Russian inspired and supported crackdown on the liberalization movement in Poland also reminds us that Moscow remains intent on maintaining that empire.

I hope that these grim reminders of Russia's tendencies will make our Nation more skeptical and more critical in our dealings with that nation, whether it is on matters of trade or in the life-or-death discussions of arms reduction and nuclear proliferation.

Yet, the recent tragic event in Poland in particular offer some hopeful signs for the free world and for the citizens of captive nations in Ukraine, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

For one, the Polish experience gives us real evidence of deep discontent within the Russian empire.

It shows there are cracks in the Iron Curtain.

It shows that the Communist economic and political system is an unnatural way of life that cannot—even under the most sustained repression—extinguish the natural desire of human beings to have the freedom to choose how they live their lives. As President Reagan said last June:

It is impossible—and history reveals this—for any form of government to completely deny freedom to people and have that go on interminably. There eventually comes an end to it. And I think the things we're seeing, not only in Poland but the reports that are beginning to come out of Russia itself about the younger generation and its resistance to long-time government controls, is an indication that communism is an aber-

ration. It's not a normal way of living for human beings, and I think we are seeing the first, beginning cracks, the beginning of the end.

The imposition of martial law in Poland to squelch the Solidarity-led effort to obtain broader economic and political freedom testifies to Russia's concern that the Polish problem would spread to other captive nations. The Russian leaders know freedom is contagious.

Despite the imposition of martial law, that desire—in Poland and elsewhere—for freedom has not been squelched.

It is also hopeful that reports indicate the Polish military regime, the Catholic Church leadership and solidarity leader Lech Walesa are involved in discussions that seek to maintain some of the economic gains made during the previous 18 months.

I hope this evidence of continued discontent behind the Iron Curtain buttresses our Nation's resolve not only to offer moral support but to use whatever political, social and economic tools are available to nourish those seeds of discontent. For one, we must insure adequate funding for agencies like the Voice of America, which beams the truth to help sustain Eastern Europe's flames of freedom.

As we commemorate this 64th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, therefore, we can take heart that the flame of freedom burning in Poland is not a solitary one. There are many such flames burning behind the Iron Curtain. Eventually, many will ignite and consume the Communist dictatorships.

President Reagan sounded that note of optimism in his address last May at the University of Notre Dame, when he said:

The years ahead are great ones for this country, for the cause of freedom and the spread of civilization. The West won't contain communism, it will transcend communism. It won't bother to dismiss or denounce it, it will dismiss it as some bizarre chapter in history whose last pages are even now being written.

I hope and pray that these Presidential remarks are prophetic and that we in our lifetime will join in observing the Independence Day of an independent Ukraine and no longer need to observe Captive Nations Week. ●

THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' FLEXIBLE AND COMPRESSED WORK SCHEDULES ACT OF 1982

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Employ-

ees' Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1982. This legislation will provide permanent authorization to allow Federal agencies to use flexible and compressed employee work schedules.

Since the early 1970's, more and more private businesses in America have adopted a variety of flexible work schedules for employees. Today, it is estimated that nearly 10 million full-time workers enjoy flexible work schedules and compressed workweeks, and an additional 12 million workers hold permanent part-time jobs. These variations from the standard, fixed-schedule 8-hour workday evolved as a means of coping with social change, particularly the dramatic increase of women in the work force, and the desire of all employees for a better accommodation between their working and personal lives. Employers found that they benefited from higher usage of buildings and equipment, decreased traffic congestion, and improved attendance, punctuality and morale. Because employees feel they have more control over their working lives, flexible schedules encourage workers to devote more responsibility to organizing their own work. Flexible schedules have also helped reduce the conflicts between work and personal needs, particularly for working women and others with household responsibilities.

Taking a cue from the private sector, during the past 3 years more than 320,000 Federal employees in 1,500 organizations took part in a highly successful experimental program temporarily authorized by Congress. The Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1978 allowed experimentation with a number of alternatives to the traditional fixed-schedule 8-hour workday. As this authorization will expire on March 29, 1982, I am introducing legislation providing permanent authorization of the same program.

The 1978 act required the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to submit a report on the results of the experiment and legislative recommendations no later than September 30, 1981, so that Congress would have sufficient time to consider permanent legislation in an orderly fashion. As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, I had planned to hold hearings last October. Unfortunately, we did not receive the report from OPM until November 9 and, as a result, our hearings had to be postponed. In addition, although OPM recommends that the program be continued, it has yet to propose permanent authorizing legislation. Therefore, I feel compelled to introduce this legislation in order to avert the mass confusion that would result if the authorization lapsed due to the administration's irresponsibility. I have sched-

uled hearings on this bill for February 3 and 9.

OPM's recalcitrance is perplexing in view of their favorable findings on the 3-year experiment. The original legislation required OPM to study the impact of alternative work schedules on Government efficiency, transportation, energy consumption, service to the public, increased employment opportunities, and quality of life for employees and their families. In brief, OPM found that all of the alternative work schedules used in the experiment were successful in most situations from the perspectives of experimenting organizations, service to the public, and employees, and recommended that Congress enact permanent legislation. However, with only 2 months left in the current authorization, the administration has not submitted proposals to continue this program it purportedly advocates.

I intend to move quickly on the legislation I am introducing today, and I hope to be back shortly before this House with a bill approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am hopeful that at that time this body will vote to permanently authorize this highly successful and worthwhile program.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' FLEXIBLE AND COMPRESSED WORK SCHEDULES ACT OF 1982

This legislation, introduced by Congresswoman FERRARO, permanently authorizes the use of alternative work schedules in the Federal Government. This authorization is identical to the authorization for the successful experiment conducted during the past 3 years. The program permits, but does not require, Government agencies to utilize flexible and compressed work schedules.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

Permanently authorizes the use of flexible and compressed work schedules in Federal agencies;

Provides that OPM shall prescribe necessary regulations, provide assistance to agencies, and conduct periodic evaluations;

Allows broad management discretion in establishing limits on the use of flexible schedules to prevent disruption of agency operations or additional agency costs;

Requires negotiation prior to implementation of flexible and compressed work schedule programs in units where an organization of Government employees has been accorded exclusive recognition;

Subject to collective bargaining agreements, allows OPM or the agency to terminate any program if it determines it is not in the best interest of the public, the Government, or the employees;

Allows individuals to elect arrival and departure times within established parameters consistent with agency requirements;

Waives the provisions of 5 U.S.C. and the FLSA relating to premium pay for overtime work upon election by employees or negotiation by a recognized union of employees to participate in a flexible or compressed schedule program;

Allows employees to request a personal hardship exemption from participating in compressed schedule programs;

Prohibits coercion concerning employees rights to participate in flexible and compressed workweek programs;

Allows the carryover of a limited number of credit hours from one pay period to the next;

Upon a request by the employee, allows the agency to grant compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay; and

Waives provisions related to night differential pay based on an election by the employee to work certain hours.●

THE WELFARE MONSTROSITY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to hear the state of the Union message from the President, I am sure that some members of the press are ready to continue their attack that Government policies are aimed at mainly aiding the affluent and hurting the poor. The enclosed article by Marvin Stone clearly refutes the crescendo of hysteria directed at President Reagan's reductions in welfare services. Please President Reagan "hang tough," Mr. Stone is correct—you are on the right track.

[FROM THE U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, FEB. 1, 1982]

THE WELFARE MONSTROSITY

(By Marvin Stone)

President Reagan, in forthcoming messages to Congress, is prepared to call for more cuts in government social services—thus stimulating a further round of aggressive protest.

Liberals especially will tell us again how the Reagan administration is hurting the poor by cutting back on welfare programs. And again they will find a sympathetic response among this country's basically openhearted population.

But Americans should consider the facts before they get carried away by their emotions. They should look not only at the ballooning costs of welfare programs in this country but also at the effects of those programs.

First, the costs. In this fiscal year, nearly 70 million people will collect more than 350 billion dollars from the federal government in payment of what have become known as "entitlements"—and that is almost half of all federal spending.

"Entitlements" include many things besides welfare—and most cause no quarrel, such as Social Security benefits, medicare, medicaid, veterans' benefits and so forth.

As for welfare payments alone, they account for 91 billion dollars this year. Notice how these costs have grown: In 1964, just before President Johnson launched his Great Society program of his government spending, the cost of federal welfare programs was 8.8 billion dollars, about 7 percent of all federal outlays. The cost is now more than 10 times as much and accounts for almost 13 percent of all federal spending.

Some examples: In 1964, 4.1 million people got 900 million dollars in Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC). Today, 10.9 million draw 6.8 billion dollars under AFDC.

Food stamps went to 360,000 people in 1964 at a cost of 30 million dollars. Now, 22 million people get food stamps at a cost of 9.6 billion dollars.

Has this kind of spending accomplished its purpose of eliminating poverty?

There were 36.1 million Americans officially classified as poor in 1964. Today, 29.3 million are so classified. But there are more people getting welfare aid now than there were when President Johnson began his War on Poverty. The more people we help, it seems, the more people there are who seek help.

This is one reason this administration is taking a harder look at our welfare programs and trying to get them under some kind of control. The President feels there must be some better way than the methods of the past.

Thomas Sowell, a senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, who is black, had something to say about this in a recent syndicated column. He wrote:

"A few years ago, someone calculated how much it would cost to lift every man, woman and child in America out of poverty by simply giving them money. It was one third of what was being spent on poverty programs."

Much of the tax money voted to help the poor never reaches them. Instead, Sowell points out, it trickles down to hordes of people paid to devise and run the welfare programs—"administrators, statisticians, consultants, economists, sociologists, think tanks, universities, social agencies and miscellaneous boondoggles."

A charge often heard is that Reagan is trying to balance the budget at the expense of the poor, that he is following a "trickle down" economic policy—justifying tax breaks for the better-off on the theory that their gains will trickle down to help the poor. When you consider the mammoth yearly expenditures we have cited, it's not hard to agree with Sowell that "the welfare state is the ultimate in 'trickle down' policies."

No one is suggesting that we turn our backs on the truly needy. We are by and large a compassionate people. But we have a right to insist that fraud and waste and malfeasance in these programs must go. We have a right to insist that the time has come to tame the federal welfare monstrosity that has been created. The President says that less money, spent more wisely, will benefit us all. The President is on the right track. ●

SUPPLY SIDE ECONOMICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, much criticism has been raised in the recent press about the President's economic program, projected deficits, and tax cuts. In the main, it is hollow rhetoric. The following are two articles from U.S. News and World Report and the Wall Street Journal which thoughtfully address these concerns. There is no question severe problems exist. Equally clear, however, are the solutions. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 18, 1982]

WHAT WENT WRONG WITH "SUPPLY SIDE" ECONOMICS

(Interview With Arthur B. Laffer, Economist)

Q. Professor Laffer, the economic picture now is far worse than President Reagan predicted when he came into office a year ago. What went wrong?

A. The administration and Congress postponed the tax cuts. I put much of the blame on David Stockman, director of the Office of Management and Budget. This is the Stockman recession and the Stockman deficit. He was too concerned about budget deficits and watered down the tax cuts, which has slowed the economy. Stockman, with his talk of huge deficits, tax increases and more budget cuts, is fighting to bring back the days of Herbert Hoover. He's trying to scare people.

Deficits aren't the cause of bad economics; deficits are the consequence of bad economics. You never balance the budget when you have slow growth, high unemployment, high inflation and high interest rates, as we do now.

Q. But Reagan's business-tax cut was not postponed, and the personal-tax cut was postponed for only a short period of time. Is the mechanism of "supply side" economics so delicate that even small changes upset it?

A. I'll answer with an illustration. Suppose you have to go back to school and won't earn any income for a year. You have to decide whether to go this year when income-tax rates are high or next year when they are low. So which year do you go to school? This year, of course.

Now, apply that to the tax structure. We have had a cut in personal income taxes so far of 1.25 percent in 1981. In 1982, we'll have a 10 percent cumulative cut. In 1983, it will be a 20 percent cumulative cut. The whole economy works on incentives like these. What's happening is that people are putting off investments and income-producing work now to wait for a more favorable tax situation.

As it is, the savings rate already has gone up substantially in response to new incentives. Businesses are certainly using the new tax-leasing arrangements in which firms with unused tax credits sell them, in effect, to other profitable firms that can use them and, in the process, lease back certain property. These leases may not have been the smartest step the government could have made, but people are moving very quickly to

use the incentives that are there. Just think of the great shape we'd be in if the tax incentives scheduled to take effect in future years were in effect now.

Q. Business is saying that high interest rates are what's keeping them from going ahead with new investment. Doesn't that situation preclude greater investment even if the tax cuts had taken effect earlier?

A. Sure. Clearly, low interest rates, whatever the tax structure, would be better than high ones. Vice versa, with a given interest-rate structure, low taxes are better than high ones for investment purposes.

Q. With the economic policies now in place, when is the recession going to end?

A. Nineteen eighty-two will probably be sluggish, but not as bad as 1981. Then 1983 will be great, and 1984 will be phenomenal. Once the incentives to postpone taxes are gone, people will make production decisions immediately instead of waiting.

Q. If 1983 and 1984 turn out as well as you are predicting, will the federal-budget deficit be shrinking, rather than ballooning as some estimates suggest?

A. Yes. The deficit in and of itself is not a problem. It's a barometer of what's going on. Right now, it's an indicator that our economy is sicker than a dog. But the way you solve a deficit is to create economic growth and low inflation. These huge estimates are sabotaging Reagan's Presidency. It's strictly scare tactics. If you look back at estimates OMB has made in the past, they are never anywhere close to the later reality. Whoever is putting out these wild numbers is trying to unelect Reagan, the same way that Hoover was unelected.

Q. Who's behind the numbers?

A. The people who want to raise taxes. When you talk about a 182-billion-dollar deficit, it scares people. It also leads you to grasp for solutions. And the solutions they're grasping for are what they call revenue enhancers. I call them tax increases. These are the same people who fought the President's tax-rate reductions all the way. What they don't see is that the tax reductions are what it takes to get the economic growth we need to eliminate the deficits.

Q. But Republicans in Congress are saying the same things—

A. Then Republicans have serious problems in their own party. They have never been friendly to supply-side economics—it's just Ronald Reagan who is.

Q. What should be President Reagan's strategy in the 1983 budget that will be unveiled later this month?

A. The President should do all he can to spur economic growth. No. 1, he should make all the tax cuts effective retroactive to Jan. 1, 1982. No. 2, he should go back to convertibility—that is, a version of the gold standard—as fast as possible. He should restore some of the funds that have been cut for social programs. Finally, he should pressure the Federal Reserve to bring interest rates down. High rates won't solve our inflation problem.

Q. If the President were to do all that, when would we begin to see results?

A. You would see the benefits right away. It may take a long time to offset the total damage to the economy, but you wouldn't have hard times.

Q. Why will 1982 be better than 1981? Won't people wait to invest until 1983 when there is a bigger tax cut?

A. There will be some of that, but the tax situation nevertheless is better in 1982 than in 1981. That's why I was so strongly against postponing the tax cuts. If it's good,

it's good doing it now. If the President were to advance all the tax cuts to 1982, it would be a phenomenal year. And we would balance the budget by 1983 or 1984. The situation now is very close to what we faced in 1961-62. If you remember, in 1961 President Kennedy's popularity was falling, the stock market was falling. Then, in 1962, he came through with the first of a series of cuts that eventually included shorter depreciation, investment credits, a series of across-the-board individual-tax cuts, corporate-tax cuts, as well as his version of taking us back to the gold standard. The stock market hit its trough in the spring of the year, and then we started on the long, roaring '60s.

Q. Inflation today is much higher than it was in Kennedy's day. Won't big tax cuts worsen the problem?

A. In my view, inflation pushes people into higher tax brackets. Inflation is a tax increaser. So any tax-rate reduction that you would make when there is no inflation needs to be bigger if you have inflation. It takes a bigger tax cut now to get the same effect we had in the 1960s.

Q. Do you see a need for deeper tax cuts than have already been enacted? And in what form?

A. We surely never want a tax on corporate profits. It makes no sense at all. If a firm wastes resources and does poorly, the government bails it out; if a firm uses resources efficiently and makes a good profit, we tax the heck out of it. I'd favor a value-added tax at the corporate level to substitute for an income tax. We also should do away with progression in the tax code for individuals. It makes no sense to tax incomes at very high rates, because it destroys incentive to earn and invest.

Q. Would you end deductions and exemptions?

A. Sure. I'd like to have a flat value-added tax under which taxes are included in the price of goods and everyone who buys something winds up paying the same tax rate.

Q. Why did you say Reagan should restore some of the budget cuts in social programs?

A. I'd never risk the security of Americans in order to balance the budget. If there is waste and fraud, cut it out. But you don't solve the deficit problem by cutting off food stamps to people who are out of a job. You just don't do that, on moral or political grounds. It's offensive.

I surely would like to change some of the social programs, but you do it when you don't need them—in a growth economy. A boom is the necessary condition for any social-spending changes. Furthermore, you don't keep the safety net in place and then cut the welfare benefits of everyone outside the net. It creates disincentives. It's not worth it to go to work if you're a ghetto dweller. It's more advantageous to stay home and collect all the safety-net benefits that you can.

Q. What about the defense budget? Is it too big?

A. It depends on what you think we need to spend for the security of the nation. I do know that if you don't have locks on your doors, you're in trouble. And if you have 17 locks on your doors, you're wasting your money.

Q. Even if the tax cuts had come in exactly as you wanted, the government's reliance on monetary policy to contain inflation would mean continuing high interest rates. How do you expect business investment to pick up in the face of those rates?

A. You don't. The purpose of monetary policy is to make money attractive to hold.

The government has an obligation to the citizenry to guarantee the purchasing power of the monetary unit. If we made a contract for a 20-year loan, you should know what you're going to be paying me, and I should know what I would be receiving in real, inflation-adjusted terms.

In almost all situations where you find stable prices and good monetary policy, you find the government guaranteeing the value of the currency by making it convertible—backing it up with gold. That's the monetary-policy side of supply-side economics, not the high interest rates we see today.

Q. Why would a gold standard work?

A. When you have an unhinged paper currency, as we do now, it depreciates in value. People don't hold paper because they like paper; they want to hold guaranteed purchasing power. Take a look at what's happened since August, 1971, when President Nixon took us away from a fixed exchange rate. The purchasing power now of an ounce of gold is five times what it was in 1971. At \$800 an ounce, it was 10 times higher. When you see the price of gold going from \$35 an ounce to \$800 an ounce, it tells you something is wrong with money. Gold is the first refuge of the cautious.

What you're really doing with a gold standard is conferring on a dollar bill all the qualities of gold. If you have a good money, the price of gold tumbles. What we have done by making an inferior money is to subsidize the chief producers of gold—South Africa and Russia—with billions of dollars in gold purchases. The price of gold has shot up as the value of our money has declined. If you want the price of gold to tumble, make the dollar as good as gold.

Q. How do we do that? Don't we first have to cut inflation?

A. No, just the reverse. If you look at what's been done in Europe to stop hyperinflation, you go to gold to restore the value of money. What ensues is rapid economic growth, and budgets are balanced quickly. In the U.S., the last time we stopped a major inflation problem was in 1946. What did Harry Truman do? He went to a modified form of gold convertibility and cut taxes on personal and corporate income. What we had in the years just after World War II was an unemployment rate that never went as high as 6 percent. The budget was balanced four out of five years. Enormous economic growth took place in the private sector.

The way you stop inflation is by growing out of it, not by contracting the economy. I don't know of any major inflation that has been stopped by a recession, by tight money and by high interest rates. It takes economic growth to solve the problem, and you can't get growth and investment with those policies.

Q. If we went back to gold, wouldn't the Federal Reserve lose some of its power to control the money supply?

A. The Fed doesn't have complete power over the money supply now. But the answer is that you'd put that power in the hands of the private sector. Gold has nothing to do with the quantity of money; it is just a barometer of attitudes about money.

It would work this way: When the Fed sees people selling gold to get dollars, it would know it didn't have enough dollars in circulation, so it would go into its open-market operations and buy government bonds in order to get more dollars in circulation. Then people would stop buying dollars with their gold.

Likewise, when people are turning in their dollars for gold, you know there are too

many dollars outstanding, so you sell bonds on the open market until they stop. You use gold as the indicator of policy.

Obviously, you never go to the point where you let gold run your world. Suppose, for instance, someone discovers a new way to produce gold at \$5 an ounce in unlimited quantities. In that case, you go off gold for a while and reset the price. I don't want a pure gold standard. But let's go back to a blended system where we use it when it serves us and we don't use it when it doesn't.

Q. Then what's the point of switching? Aren't you still saying the Fed has to step in and use its judgment? That's no different from the situation today—

A. The difference is that today we are not using any of the beneficial aspects of a gold standard. My proposal would specify in advance the conditions under which gold convertibility would be suspended and later re-established. Adjustments will be likely, and they should be done without destroying the system. The essential point remains that we need a money whose value is guaranteed, so that when I make a 30-year contract with you I will know what that currency will be worth at the end of the contract. It's nonsense to think that the current policy of slowing growth in the quantity of money will slow inflation. The reason is that the demand for money is just as important as the supply of it.

To show you what I mean, substitute apples for dollar bills. If I grow a bumper crop, the quantity of apples increases and the price of each falls. If there's a shortage, the price or value of each goes up. With money, the faster it grows, the higher inflation; the slower money grows, the lower inflation.

Now look at the other side of the equation. Say scientists discover that apples have strong aphrodisiac qualities. There's a huge increase in demand, the price goes up, apple growers pick their trees cleaner and grow more varieties. There's an increase in the quantity of apples as the value of each unit goes up.

Take a second situation. The surgeon general announces that apples cause a dangerous illness. Demand disappears, the price tumbles and the quantity tumbles.

I'm saying there is a demand curve and supply curve in every market, including money. Every classical economist knows that when you make a good money, you have more of it. If we made the dollar as good as gold, the quantity of money would increase enormously because we would have finally made money desirable. I want to see the quantity of money double, not because the Federal Reserve has more printed but because money is in demand.

Q. How good a job is the Federal Reserve doing today?

A. The Fed has no control over the quantity of money at all. I'd like to see the board reduce its taxes on the domestic banking system—that is, lower the interest rate on borrowed reserves, reduce the discount rate and reduce reserve requirements on banks. The point is to make money more attractive to banks, to increase demand for it.

Q. Just what is supply-side economics, in your view?

A. It's basically looking at incentives. People base their actions on incentives. When you change those incentives, they change their behavior. For instance, people don't work to pay taxes. They work to get what they can after taxes. The after-tax return determines whether a person works,

or sits on the beach of Malibu, or changes jobs. People don't save to go bankrupt. They save to augment their wealth, not reduce it. Therefore, it's the after-tax rate of return on savings that determines the volume of savings, not the level of income.

In today's environment, supply-side economics means changing the tax structure so that productive investment gets the same or a better rate of return than nonproductive ones, such as investing in a law firm or in gold hidden in a basement or a Bermuda offshore corporation. The real problem is that today you make more money with those kinds of investments than in building steel mills, cement plants and asphalt factories.

Q. Aren't you promising a free lunch for the economy—that we can achieve high growth and low inflation without any pain?

A. Well, that is the whole purpose of economics—to create added value. Every time you make someone better off, it doesn't mean that someone else is worse off. If you develop a new widget that does its job twice as well, you're better off and every widget purchaser in the world is better off. You have created free lunches.

Q. Do you feel your supply-side theories have been abandoned by the Reagan administration? Do we now have a jerry-built economic strategy in place? And will it work?

A. Our policies haven't been abandoned. Reagan didn't back down on tax cuts. Sure, they're not as fast as I'd like to have had them. But they are on the books. Now we just have to sit and wait. Postponing them won't improve the situation. But 1983 will come and 1984 will come, and the economy will be in great shape.

Q. What is your view on why Wall Street doesn't seem to believe the program will work?

A. Wall Street probably has a good chance of being right. The chance of Stockman's winning this battle and dismantling the supply-side tax cuts is reasonably high. Stockman was the guy who put the plank in the Republican platform on gold; now he talks it down. He's the guy who advocated all the tax cuts; now he wants tax increases. He whispers one thing to the Atlantic monthly magazine and says other things publicly—both of which are quite different from what he tells people privately.

There is one supply-side "mole" in the White House. It's the President. He's the only guy who wants it.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 14, 1982]

VOODOO POLITICS

President Reagan spent 55 minutes Monday listening to the House Republican leadership plead for higher taxes. While they differed sharply on which taxes to raise, all except Rep. Jack Kemp wanted some tax increase. At the end, the President made two remarks: That he could never see the difference between "crowding out" by government borrowing and "crowding out" through higher taxes. And that he and other Republicans weren't elected to raise taxes and government spending.

The session will be repeated Friday with Senate Republican leaders, who are even worse than their House colleagues. After writing a lavish farm bill, Senator Dole wants a tighter minimum tax, which we are going to call "the wheat-growers tax," a companion to the "Tombigbee-Clinch River tax" we dedicated a few weeks ago to Senator Baker. Except in the grossest pork-barrel sense, we cannot fathom the appeal

of tax increases to Republicans who have to face the electorate in 1982 or 1984.

The elections next November are going to be dominated by the success or failure of the Reagan economic policies. But whether or not the economy is in recovery by then, we do not see how Republican chances would be improved by proposing now to increase taxes a year hence. If the economy has not recovered, the proposal to increase taxes in the face of recession will look ludicrous. If the economy has recovered, the tax increase proposal will look like a retreat in the face of victory. Yet this is the ground much of the GOP wants to stake out.

There is of course idle talk flitting about that seems to suggest that a 1983 tax boost is just the tonic to spark a 1982 recovery. Any skepticism about this novel theory is brushed off as "voodoo economics." The notion seems to be that a good stiff tax increase would spark a recovery by igniting a rally in the bond markets. On this the GOP is urged to stake its future.

Now, the bond markets remain profoundly discouraging, with long-term interest rates back at or near their historic highs. The sustained boom we all would like to see is hard to conceive unless these rates come down to more normal levels. Almost certainly the high rates reflect a lack of confidence that monetary restraint can be sustained over the long term. The fear is that the Fed lacks both the intellectual understanding to hew to a non-inflationary monetary policy, and also the political will to conduct such a policy under pressures that arise from fiscal policy.

The fiscal pressures, though, are only secondarily those of deficits. Deficits do of course matter, though not in the simplistic way the old-time religion teaches. As President Reagan's remark about "crowding out" suggests, the primary fiscal pressure is from government spending; whether this is covered by taxes or borrowing is a secondary matter. Long-term bond markets have long since ceased to exist in those European nations that have boosted taxes to 50 percent of national income. Here at home, does anyone seriously believe that 30-year bonds will rally if taxes were increased but nothing were done to correct the imbalances in the Social Security system?

In truth, the intra-GOP battle over the deficit is a battle less over economic theory than over political symbols. Some agree that lower spending is the true goal, but argue that the deficit is the club for achieving this. Our contributor Herbert Stein writes movingly on this theme, unchastened by his experience in the Nixon administration. In fact, experience seems to suggest that the deficit is a club to get Republicans to levy taxes to cover Democratic spending programs. If the "Reagan revolution" is not about ending this no-win game for both his party and the nation, it is about nothing at all.

President Reagan himself seems to understand this well, at least to judge by his concluding remarks to the House leaders. What he needs to do now is send up a budget without major tax increases, and attach a note saying that if Congress is disturbed by the deficit numbers he will work up some further ideas on expenditure reductions. Then at the very least he is in a position to bargain with Congress. We see nothing he can gain, either economically or politically, by heeding the chorus of voices urging him to start compromising with himself before the real horse-trading begins.

THE ANXIOUS AGED

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the following Wall Street Journal article of January 6, 1982, describes the fear of the Nation's elderly for the actions of the present administration that is led by one of their own generation. The Reagan administration's lack of concern for the plight of many of the Nation's elderly has been displayed by vicious budget cutting that threatens to leave many elderly hungry, homeless, and destitute. It is a cruel thing when the attitudes and actions of a governing administration are increasingly, pitifully feared by the Nation's most vulnerable.

THE ANXIOUS AGED—MANY ELDERLY FEAR REAGAN BUDGET CUTS, AND SOME FIGHT BACK
(By Hal Lancaster)

CHICAGO.—Residents of the Division La Salle Senior Apartments here face all the traditional enemies of the aged: fears of infirmity and death, of night and the hostile streets, of loneliness, of poverty.

And now they also fear Reaganomics. However Ronald Reagan's economic program may eventually turn out for the country as a whole, it has already stirred deep emotions in the aged. It has angered the middle-class elderly, who are fighting back with the political muscle generated by growing numbers, and it has frightened the elderly poor, who have neither the means nor the inclination to fight back.

UNSETTLING FEARS

Thus far, the cutbacks haven't justified the fears. Mr. Reagan's proposed fiscal 1982 budget won't plunge masses of the elderly into starvation, although the cuts certainly will hurt. But with mounting budget-deficit projections and consequent concern about reigniting inflation putting pressure on the President, fiscal 1983 and beyond could bring harsher cuts to programs that help the elderly. And for people such as the 300 residents of the Division La Salle public-housing project, who lean heavily on federal largess, the fear of cuts can be nearly as damaging as cuts themselves.

"They're confused. They don't understand the explanations" offered by government-agency people, says Dianne Brauer, a social worker who visits this dormitory-like brick building at least once a week. "Even if their checks aren't being cut, there's a fear they're going to be and, therefore, a lessening of security." Indeed, one panicky resident, fearful of losing federal medical aid, recently purchased private health insurance that "was totally unnecessary," Mrs. Brauer says. "She was completely covered."

Of course, even budget planners find fiscal 1982 budget proposals mystifying. The effects on social services are "impossible to trace," concedes a spokesman for the Office of Management and Budget. What can be stated unequivocally is that most cash benefits haven't been touched, he adds.

PROBABLE CHANGES

Senior-citizens groups contend that other, seemingly benign, changes mount up to con-

siderable damage. Behind the blizzard of titles and sections that make up the complex budget, some conclusions can be drawn. When the fiscal 1982 budget is finally approved, it is likely to contain these provisions, a variety of experts say:

Reduced food-stamp benefits. The value of food stamps will be cut by a delay in cost-of-living adjustments. Until next September, food-stamp values will be computed on the basis of September 1980 food prices. Also, an \$11.3 billion cap on food-stamp expenditures could force across-the-board cuts if unemployment continues to increase and the cap isn't raised.

Increased Medicare-Medicaid costs. Most senior citizens will face a \$69 increase in Medicare deductibles, although some of that is inflation-related. They also will pay a greater portion of costs for hospital stays beyond 60 days. Trimming of the more comprehensive, state-administered Medicaid program, which serves the poor, could hurt even more. About 41% of Medicaid funds pay nursing-home bills, and senior-citizen groups envision numerous evictions from these facilities if a proposed \$1 billion cut in federal support is enacted. If states can't fill the financing void, other senior citizens could lose part or all of their Medicaid benefits and be left with the less complete Medicare coverage.

Reduced rent subsidies. Over a five-year period, senior citizens' share of rents at public-housing projects will increase to 30% of their gross income from 25%.

Reduced public-housing construction. Construction money was cut 4%, reducing planned units by 5,000. About one-third of public-housing residents are elderly. "If we are required to cut back from our current level, it would cause a severe problem for us in our operating budget," says Andrew J. Mooney, the executive director of the Chicago Housing Authority. Already, projects have been shelved, including an ambitious complex that would have included on-the-spot medical and in-home care. Maintenance also has been impaired, Mr. Mooney says.

Elimination of the minimum Social Security benefit for new retirees. This has been a hot potato. The administration wanted to eliminate an estimated three million recipients of the \$122-a-month minimum payment for those with limited work records. Congress objected. The compromise recently reached: Current recipients will be restored, but new retirees won't be added to the minimum-benefit rolls after Jan. 1.

A social-services puzzle. The "new federalism" shifts much responsibility for social services to the states through block grants that contain 25% across-the-board cuts. More efficient state programs and a loosening of federal strings will make up the difference, Reaganites insist. Many financially squeezed states aren't so sure.

So far, Washington has loosened strings in some areas but tightened them in others, says Peg R. Blaser, the director of the Illinois Department on Aging. Under the block grant, for example, "very stringent" requirements for social-services reimbursements to the states were dropped, she says. But restrictions on the use of surplus food sold to the states have been increased and the complex pricing formula changes; as a result, paper work has increased.

Still, she insists, the state "can meet legal mandates" at proposed financing levels. And there will be efficiency savings. Recently, for example, she discovered that her department and a nearby university, unbeknownst to each other, were conducting almost-iden-

tical research projects financed with federal money. Many research projects are being dropped, she says.

Some social-service programs will be spared because the Older Americans Act, which finances a wide variety of programs, wasn't lumped into block grant or cut significantly. But it wasn't increased, either, and so inflation is forcing cutbacks anyway. "We're taking our lumps in personnel and hanging on to service dollars," Mrs. Blaser says.

Moreover, crucial programs for the elderly still could be lost in the fierce jostling for remaining block grants and state funds. Of particular concern: in-home medical and housekeeping aid. Without it, many elderly could be forced into nursing homes.

FISCAL 1983 BUDGET

Also of great concern are the current discussions about the budget for fiscal 1983, which begins next Oct. 1. Because of the large projected deficit, Mr. Reagan is expected to propose this month deep cuts in social programs. "This will be the most important budget battle of the Reagan term," says Robert Greenstein, a private Washington researcher who analyzes the effects of budget proposals on the poor.

Among proposals being discussed in the administration are two that would seriously reduce food-stamp benefits to the elderly. One would raise to 35 percent from 30 percent the portion of income subtracted from projected food costs to determine the benefit level. That seemingly modest change gets magnified in the calculations, and the people who would suffer the largest proportional cuts would be the elderly, Mr. Greenstein explains. He says monthly food stamps for an elderly couple with monthly income of \$425 would drop to \$10 from \$26.

In addition, the administration also will apparently seek to reduce food-stamp benefits by \$3.50 to \$5 for each \$10 of low-income energy assistance received. About 40 percent of these recipients are elderly and would lose a significant part of their food stamps during winter months.

The 1983 budget probably will include drastic reductions in new public-housing construction, and it could change radically the Medicare and housing-payment systems in ways that senior-citizen groups contend (and Reaganites deny) could make them more costly to the elderly. One possibility: Instead of reimbursing actual costs, the government could make one payment annually, based on average costs. That would effectively cap government expenditures. Political opposition could force modifications, but severe cuts of some kind are considered definite in both areas.

There is also discussion of adding the value of food stamps received to income calculations. That change would mean increased rent payments for residents of subsidized housing, who pay a percentage of their income.

REAGAN'S DEFENDERS

Of course, believers in the Reagan program contend that his tax cuts, tax indexing beginning in 1984 and, especially, the hoped-for reduction in inflation will offset budget cuts. "The elderly are most hurt by inflation," says Curt Clinkscales, the national director of the conservative National Alliance of Senior Citizens. "With lessened inflation, their dollars will go further."

Besides, he contends, the needy will be protected while the greedy will be exposed. "So many people who are not poor are getting benefits," he says. "I see these old

people partaking in these federally funded meal programs and, my God, they're driving down there in Cadillacs."

Among the elderly, such believers are probably a minority, however. Most see their checks reduced and their out-of-pocket costs increased—and they worry. "The cuts aren't a lot, mostly under \$20 a month so far," says Mrs. Brauer, the social worker. "But when you're living on \$250 a month, that's quite a bit."

The cuts could have been worse but for political pressure from the elderly. In a rapidly aging society, the political voice of the aged has grown ever louder. There are 25 million of them, and a higher percentage of them vote than in other age groups. In fact, this country could be a gerontocracy by the next century, contends Fernando Torres-Gil, an assistant professor of gerontology and public administration at the University of Southern California. "It's no accident that Reagan's program was sailing along until he got to Social Security; then the elderly showed their muscle."

But the senior citizens who jeered administration officials at the recent White House conference on aging and haunt the halls of Congress are light-years away from the residents of Division La Salle. Here, Mr. Reagan has brought despair and helplessness, Mrs. Brauer says, and little political militancy. "I wish I'd see that, but I don't," she says. "They seem more beaten than ever."

Each weekday, 75 or so of the elderly gather here about 11 a.m., register, pay 75 cents, take a number and wait for their federally subsidized meals. The cafeteria is one of a handful of "nutrition centers" serving meals to the elderly around the city. Some of the diners, therefore, don't live in the building; they are all old and poor, though.

The meal is franks and beans, and Wanda Jablonski, 86 years old, picks at her food while a neighbor takes some of her milk. So far, she says, her food stamps have been cut from \$44 a month to \$10. Why? "I don't remember," she says. Also, she complains, visits to a doctor for her glaucoma cost her \$25. "Now the government doesn't want to give nothing for that," she says.

Still, her greatest fear concerns her \$235-a-month Social Security benefit. "They should never cut my Social Security. Can you see that my benefits aren't cut?" She asks a visitor who has nothing to do with government programs.

LITTLE CHANGE SO FAR

Sammie Stewart, 69, hasn't felt much change yet. "It's just anxiety right now, from what you read," he says. "Besides, there's nothing he (Mr. Reagan) can do that can affect me; my budget is very low."

Mr. Stewart won't give numbers, but says he lives off Social Security and food stamps. "I only get a small amount of food stamps, but it helps out," he says. "With my small Social Security, I barely make ends meet." Neither has been cut, he says, but he fears the future. Transportation for the elderly is being reduced and, in a year, he predicts that the subsidized lunches such as those served here will be cut down or cut out. "It doesn't make sense to spend millions of dollars on arms they're never going to use when there are people here who need food," he says.

Budget cutbacks at the federal, state and local levels seem to snowball by the time they reach the people here—at a time when rents, utility bills and food prices are climbing. William Siegel, community and tenant-relations aide for the building, provides a

laundry list of troubles: Food stamps are being cut back. So are maintenance services. "About 300 craftsmen were cut by the Chicago Housing Authority," he says. "If the toilets are backed up or a room needs repainting, it will take longer." Free entertainment that used to be provided for parties in the building and the buses that used to be supplied for outings have been eliminated. Because of the Reagan budget cuts? he is asked. "That's what I was told," he says.

MILITANT EXCEPTION

Sidney De Koben, 70, is an exception here; he is a true militant. Mr. De Koben belongs to a group called Metro Seniors in Action, and he has taken to the streets and the streets to protest Reaganomics. "These are vicious cuts," he says. "It's like a vicious Robin Hood taking from the poor and giving to the rich."

What is of most concern to him, like the majority of residents here, is Social Security. "It provides them with a bit of pride," Mrs. Brauer explains. "It isn't public-dole money; they feel they earned it, that they put it in there."

Mr. De Koben, once a manual laborer, receives \$335 a month from Social Security. He spends \$40.50 a month on rent (excluding his electricity bill). He doesn't get food stamps. "I think I'm above that (income) level," he says, conceding that he isn't sure and will check with social-services people. "I don't eat so much anyway," he adds.

"There's going to be some cuts" in Social Security, he says. "Reagan says he won't hurt the present people, but in the future, he'll have to cut them, too."

NEWBORN LION

"I hate to be vicious," he adds, "but we should drive the snakes out of Washington like St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland." He leans back, smiling. "I used to be quiet as a lamb," he says. "Now, I roar like a lion."

The next day, government representatives appear at the building for a briefing on how the budget proposals will affect the elderly. Speakers discuss Social Security, Medicaid and food stamps, with a mind-boggling maze of eligibility and cross-eligibility requirements and exceptions. The questions are similar: nuts-and-bolts queries about cuts in government checks. The answers are frequently followed by residents complaining, "I just don't understand it." And there is skepticism about the Social Security spokesman's contention that the system is running out of money. Finally, state Rep. Jesse White concludes the seemingly fruitless meeting.

"Mr. De Koben asked if we had any good news," he says. "Frankly, no. I know you've been tightening your belts, but you may have to tighten them some more." ●

WOLFE PUBLICATIONS: 25 YEARS OF QUALITY SERVICE

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in an age of nationwide newspaper chains and syndicates, I find it exciting to follow the progress of the small independent newspapers and locally owned

chains that service my home region of western New York. One of New York's—if not the Nation's—finest newspaper publishers, Andrew D. Wolfe, is currently celebrating his 25th anniversary as the owner of seven western New York weekly newspapers. His success is an indication that hope for the future of independent, local newspapers is not entirely misplaced.

Twenty-five years ago, Andrew D. Wolfe entered into the newspaper business in a quite and tiny way. As publisher of three small weeklies, the Brighton-Pittsford Post, the East Rochester Herald, and the Penfield Republican, Wolfe turned out about 1,250 issues each week. As his silver anniversary report on the first 25 years notes, "in many ways these printing methods were closer to the methods used by Benjamin Franklin in the 1700's." But growth was just around the corner.

From a paid circulation of 1,250 with 8 pages to an issue, the 3 publications leaped to a circulation of over 3,000 with 12 to 16 pages per issue within a year.

During the course of the next quarter century, Andrew D. Wolfe's entrepreneurial skills led to growth in both the size and quality of his publications. Today, his chain of seven western New York weekly newspapers includes: the Brighton-Pittsford Post, the East Rochester Post-Herald, the Penfield Post-Republican, the Henrietta Post, the Greece Post, the Irondequoit Press, and the Brockport Post. With a modern plant and superb equipment, Wolfe's outstanding staff of editors, writers, artists, sales and clerical staff have at their disposal the tools with which to turn out quality newspapers. And, judging by the continued gains in circulation over the past 25 years, the public recognizes and appreciates this quality.

Andrew Wolfe's dream of creating a quality product and a successful business enterprise has been realized seven times over. Today, his newspaper business employs over 75 full-time and 40 part-time people; gross business volume in 1982 is expected to exceed \$2 million.

The tributes that come with 25 successful years in business are always well earned. But, when they come in the very tough business of publishing local weekly newspapers, they are even more deserved. Andrew Wolfe has done a service to his community for 25 years and stands out as an example of why individual initiative and public concern still have a place in the newspaper industry.

A copy of an article reviewing the first 25 years of Wolfe Publications, Inc., follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF WOLFE PUBLICATIONS—25 YEARS—WEEK BY WEEK TIME FLIES SWIFTLY

A little over 25 years ago, Wolfe Publications produced three newspapers each week.

They consisted of eight small pages each, four pages of which were common or identical pages.

The press on which they were printed had been built in 1897 and then was 60 years old. The type of ads and news text was produced by temperamental linotype machines, one of which dated to 1910 and the other to 1917. A third linotype did not work, but was used as a source of spare parts for the other two.

The papers were printed on individual sheets, fed into the press by a pressman standing on a small platform about 40 inches above the floor. Four pages were printed on one side of the sheets, which subsequently were turned over so that the remaining four pages could be printed on the reverse side.

Paid circulation was about 1,250. The principal paper was The Brighton-Pittsford Post, an outgrowth of The Pittsford Post, which had been established in 1932 in Pittsford. The other papers were The East Rochester Herald, established in 1909 as East Rochester Realities. The third paper, The Penfield Republican, had been started in 1951 by LeRoy and Esther Percy, owners from 1942 until the purchase by Andrew D. Wolfe 25 years ago.

In many ways, these printing methods were closer to the methods used by Benjamin Franklin in the 1700's than to the photo-lithographic methods used by Wolfe Publications today.

Today, there are seven newspapers, plus the New York-Pennsylvania Collector, which provides news and background on art and antique. Nearly 50,000 newspapers are printed weekly, and the Brighton-Pittsford Post, the largest newspaper, averages between 40 and 60 pages a week, with 80 pages as the record large edition.

Wolfe recalls that the first three years of his ownership were grim financially.

The company in the first year of his ownership had a gross volume of just more than \$80,000, of which nearly 25 percent came from job printing, mostly small jobs for local businessmen, and for towns, schools, and local politicians.

By the end of that year, circulation had climbed to about 3,000 and papers were running from about 12 to an occasional 16 pages.

A key development in the following year, 1958, was the appearance of Jane Mollen-dorf, now Mrs. Robert Carter, who had grown up in Brighton and had worked at the legendary Elmer's Garage at 12 Corners before moving to Chicago.

Returning here, she determined to enter the newspaper business, which had long fascinated her.

Originally, she was employed as Wolfe's secretary, but a strong business background, plus knowledge of the community and a knack of working with advertisers soon dictated a switch to advertising. With a change of personnel, she became advertising manager, a post which she was to hold for nearly 20 years. Her skill was one of the factors that made possible the development of the newspapers.

The year 1959 was pivotal.

Increasing confidence in the future of the company led Wolfe to employ a circulation development firm, a type of company then common in the news business, but which now largely has disappeared.

These firms had a pattern in which prizes were offered to local residents for selling newspapers, with the grand prize usually an automobile.

The contest, carried out in the Fall, was paralleled by the success of a colorful and exciting undefeated football team at Brighton High School. Much community interest in Brighton centered on the team, and parents and others were delighted to find complete descriptions of the games in the Brighton-Pittsford Post.

That helped make easier the word of the subscription sellers, and the circulation drive was an important success.

At its end, the Brighton-Pittsford newspaper's circulation had topped 4,500, and the overall circulation was above 6,000.

The problem, says Wolfe, was that most people in Monroe County, including advertisers, didn't readily accept the idea that a useful role could be played by well-edited community newspapers providing detailed, well-written local coverage.

"Such newspapers had been common for a decade or so in areas around New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, but had not developed here.

"Another problem was that our equipment was old, and many printing people didn't want to work in a small shop in what even then still was considered country. And the volume of business simply didn't permit employment of experienced people in news and advertising."

The result, Wolfe's directors recall, was that he wrote a good deal of the paper himself, sold most of the advertising, covered school athletic contests, took photos with an old Polaroid camera, and allocated Saturday mornings to selling subscriptions with telephone calls. Sundays went to writing editions, a personal column, and making phone calls to school coaches so that Saturday games could be written up.

The first year of his ownership, Wolfe says, was attempting to get the newspapers reorganized so that steps could be taken toward creating the kind of newspapers he envisioned.

A major step came in the Summer of 1957 when he purchased an ancient, but still serviceable roll-fed press, which could print up to 16 pages at one time.

This press, he says, like the linotype machines, was notional, but it opened the way for growth because of its greater capacity and a speed of almost 3,000 papers per hour.

Its glaring fault was the paper rolls frequently would break, each such break making necessary a 20-minute delay to remove torn paper from printing rollers and to rethread the paper through the roller.

"For the first time," Wolfe recalls, "I allowed myself to feel that possibly I had not been butting my head against a stone wall."

A machine was purchased to enable large headlines to be cast in metal. It was a major improvement over the old handset-type headlines, which often employed ancient wooden type.

Another important improvement was the purchase of a machine that could provide plastic plates for printing photos. The old method for such plates had been to send photos to a specialized plant in Florida every Sunday from the main Rochester post office before 5 p.m. The completed magnesium plates were returned via air mail by Tuesday morning—a rather remarkable procedure and performance.

More important, perhaps, was the move of the office and plant from the Monroe-Clover location to an old garage building on State St., Pittsford.

Primitive as the new quarters were in some ways, they were attractive and serviceable. The savings in rent were vital in making possible new progress.

In 1961 another circulation campaign was carried out and it brought circulation to more than 15,000.

A significant result of the campaign was that the second-prize winner, Helen Jones of Henrietta, remained with the company as circulation manager.

Her meticulous and detailed program has been a major factor in the expansion of the newspaper.

Another important step was the establishment of The Henrietta Post in 1961. This newspaper, serving Rush as well as Henrietta, filled a need in those communities for local coverage.

The following two years saw such substantial growth that it became apparent that the press bought in 1957 no longer could produce the numbers of papers needed.

There followed long study, which resulted in a decision to abandon the old "hot-lead" (metal-type) method of printing and to substitute for it phototypesetting for composition, and use of a lithographic process in printing.

Longtime friends, the Measer family, who operate the Amherst Bee in Williamsville and other Buffalo-area newspapers, were most helpful in planning this move.

And it was decided to close down printing in our own plant and have our actual printing or presswork done at Western New York Offset Press in Clarence. This plant, partially owned by the Measers, was extremely helpful as we made the complicated shift in 1964 from the old to the new printing methods.

Much finer reproduction of photos was an important result of the move.

And Western's large presses made it possible for production to keep up with expansion of the circulation rolls.

The busy year of 1964 saw circulation top 17,000. It also saw an important step in the purchase, two days before Christmas, of the old Pittsford Inn building in Pittsford as company headquarters.

Built in 1818, the old structure had been damaged in a fire and appeared to be in ramshackle condition.

But careful examination proved it to be sound. When the building had been repaired and the company moved into it in the summer of 1965, the building provided exceptionally useful space for the expanding company.

The next few years saw progress in many areas.

New typesetting equipment was bought, news coverage expanded, and the newspapers were growing in size.

The old method of keeping circulation records by hand was proving a difficult task as subscription lists grew, and a computerized system was established. This has proved a godsend.

The year 1967 saw the establishment of The Greece Post. Effort first was made to buy the old Greece Press. When this proved impossible, the company started its own newspaper. Fortunately, it quickly gained circulation and has been growing ever since.

Meanwhile, gross volume of business had been making progress.

Although the first three years of business saw growth only from about \$80,000 to \$107,000, the volume had advanced to \$225,000 by 1965.

By 1970 circulation exceeded 30,000, and gross volume of business was in excess of \$500,000.

The task of sending full-page negatives to the press in Clarence, necessitating numerous trips on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, now

was becoming onerous. And the longer press runs, plus the increased time needed for addressing, suggested that the future use of Western would become a problem if newspapers were to be delivered at the post offices on time.

Thus, in 1970, it was reluctantly decided to end the fine relationship with Western New York Offset. Again the Measers were extremely helpful in aiding to build and equip a press plant on Phillips Rd., Fishers, a half-mile from thruway Exit 45 and the eastern terminus of Route 490.

The location, near 490, would make it possible to reach all circulation areas rapidly.

The press plant was opened in 1972 and met all expectations. It was enlarged in 1975, and now houses Wolfe finance and circulation offices, as well as the press plant.

Next major steps were the establishment of The Brockport Post in 1973 and purchase of The Irondequoit Press, originally established in 1932, in 1974.

Important in the history was the addition of Michael Holvey to the management staff in 1971. A certified public accountant who had worked for a major national accounting firm, Holvey initially supervised financial aspects of the business, then becoming responsible also for production.

Later, he was assigned other aspects of general management and, in 1981, was to become president of the company (Wolfe moving to the chairmanship of the board, while remaining as editor, publisher, and chief executive officer).

A unique contribution made by Holvey was to plan installation of the company's own Wang computer systems.

Touching all aspects of the business, these systems are believed more extensive than in any newspaper company of Wolfe Publications' size. They give management exceptionally complete insight into all aspects of the business.

Meanwhile, the company had increased its job printing activities, which now specialized in newspaper printing and other periodicals.

Wolfe Publications, also, in 1976, seeking diversification, established The New York-Pennsylvania Collector to provide news of antiques and art.

Under the skilled editorship of Nancy Bolger, it has become recognized as the best-edited journal of its kind, and more than 7,500 copies are distributed each month.

Advertising grew steadily over the years. Now under the direction of Mrs. Carter's successor, Valerie DiCostanza, the department has been instituting many innovative approaches and has recorded record sales in each successive year.

Circulation of the Monroe County regional newspapers topped 42,000 in 1975, and now is approaching 50,000.

Whereas the total staff in 1957 numbered only six, there are now more than 75 full time employees, with more than 40 working on a part-time basis. Gross volume of business is expected to top \$2 million in 1982.

What does Wolfe think of all this?

"When I look at the path traveled," he says, "I think I feel tired."

But he adds: "Many wonderful people have helped develop the company, and the help from so many people in the metropolitan community has not only been heartwarming, but has been a great experience for us all."

The future?

Wolfe says: "In spite of all the developments in electronics media, and all other

manner of publication, I think the future of the true community newspaper, if it remains true to its ideals, is very secure.

"Large metropolitan newspapers have been running into many different types of problems, which fortunately do not have a major effect on competent community newspapers.

"I think the future is very promising.

"And I think we will continue to draw in people of outstanding ability because, of all the kinds of journalism, community newspapers, so close to the reader, are the most rewarding." ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 28, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 29

8:30 a.m.
Special on Aging
Business meeting, to consider the committee budget for 1982, and other committee business.
1224 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 958, imposing an additional duty upon imported articles which are the products of a nonmarket economy country.
2221 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 1

9:00 a.m.
*Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975 and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed briefing on worldwide intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on East/West relations.
4221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on proposed legislation denying tax exemption to racially discriminatory private schools.
2221 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on visa provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 94-571).
2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 2

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the work force in the Federal procurement system.
3302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Reynaldo P. Maduro, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Director of the ACTION Agency, Cathie A. Shattuck, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and William J. Bennett, of North Carolina, to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.
4232 Dirksen Building

Small Business
To hold hearings to discuss whether to increase the limitation set forth by the Davis-Bacon Act on certain small business construction loan contracts with the Federal Government.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold closed hearings on U.S. military posture, and to review the proposed budget request of the Department of Defense.
212 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on possibilities of democracy in Central America.
4221 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the postal patron provisions of Public Law 97-69, strengthening and clarifying the congressional franking law.
301 Russell Building

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending

the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 3

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Foreign Agricultural Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings to evaluate the economic impact of previous agricultural embargoes.
324 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1018, prohibiting the Federal Government from funding commercial and residential growth on undeveloped barrier beaches and islands.
4200 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1785, increasing the penalties for violations of the Taft-Hartley Act, requiring immediate removal of certain individuals convicted of crimes relating to his official position, broadening the definition of the types of positions an individual is barred from upon conviction, increasing the time of disbarment from 5 to 10 years, escrowing a convicted official's salary for the duration of his appeal, and clarifying the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor relating to detecting and investigating criminal violations relating to ERISA.
4232 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on newly authorized programs for the Adolescent Family Life Program, Tuberculosis Control Program, Preventive Medicine Residencies, Special Health Professions Initiatives, and emergency funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building
Joint Economic
To resume hearings in preparation of its forthcoming annual report, focusing on the economic status of women.
2154 Rayburn Building

FEBRUARY 4

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Tactical Warfare Subcommittee
To hold hearings on cost-growth in the Army A-H 64 attack helicopter program.
212 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing bank holding companies to establish securities affiliates which could underwrite municipal revenue bonds and operate, advise and sell shares in mutual funds.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on the proposed divestiture of American Telephone & Telegraph.

235 Russell Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975 and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1937, extending until June 30, 1985 the expiration date of section 252, which provides a limited antitrust defense for U.S. oil companies participating in the international energy program, of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To resume hearings on East/West relations.

4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

357 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 5

9:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management of the Committee on Finance on S. 1828, providing for special tax treatment of partnerships between thrift institutions and others.

2221 Dirksen Building

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs on S. 1828, providing for special tax treatment of partnerships between thrift institutions and others.

2221 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1182, proposed Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act Amendments of 1981, and S. 1785, proposed Labor Management Racketeering Act of 1981.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from John W. Hernandez, Jr., Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on the implementation of the Clean Water Act.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the Venezuela proposed arms sale.

4221 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

To begin oversight hearings on activities of Congressional support agencies, fo-

cusing on the Office of Technology Assessment.

301 Russell Building

1:30 p.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on emergency immigration powers.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 9

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Securities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing bank holding companies to establish securities affiliates which could underwrite municipal revenue bonds and operate, advise and sell shares in mutual funds.

5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1182, proposed Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act Amendments of 1981, and S. 1785, proposed Labor Management Racketeering Act of 1981.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 3782, permitting the steamship vessel, Oceanic Constitution, to enter the Hawaiian Island cruise trade.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, focusing on the Department of the Interior.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending nominations and other committee business.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed refugee assistance regulation changes.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 10

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Securities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing bank holding companies to establish securities affiliates which could underwrite municipal revenue bonds and operate, advise and sell shares in mutual funds.

5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recom-

mendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, focusing on the Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings to evaluate the Waterway User Charge Study, authorized by section 205 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-502).

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Arms Control, Oceans and International Operations, and Environment Subcommittee

To hold hearings on acid rain.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program.

4200 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 11

9:30 a.m.

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1511, clarifying the determination of the definition of a country under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and to review the effectiveness of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 in enforcing the trade agreement rights of the United States and responding to foreign practices that are inconsistent with trade agreement provisions or burden or restrict U.S. commerce.

2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Railroad Retirement Board, domestic programs of the ACTION Agency, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, focusing on the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

1202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Commission on Libraries and

Information Science, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 12

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 698, assisting the Yuma County Water Users' Association, Arizona, to relocate the headquarters of such association; S. 933, authorizing the rehabilitation of the Belle Fourche irrigation project in South Dakota; S. 1409, authorizing the enlargement of the Buffalo Bill Dam and Reservoir in Wyoming; and S. 1628, providing that the Emergency Fund Act of 1948 be available for all projects governed by Federal reclamation acts.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, OSHA Review Commission, and the Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 22

9:30 a.m.

*Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on proposed legislation establishing employment training policies.

2175 Rayburn Building

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

1318 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with House Committee on Education and Labor's

Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, on proposed legislation establishing employment training policies.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

2:00

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institutes of Health, and to review activities of the Office of the Director, Department of Health and Human Services.

1318 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 24

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Southern Nevada culinary workers' pension fund.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine certain financial institution practices restricting individuals from withdrawing funds represented by checks deposited to their accounts.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the economic impact of tourism.

235 Russell Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975 and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

*Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, Department of Health and Human Services.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
Joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Water and Power on hydroelectric development and licensing procedures.

3110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
Joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation on hydroelectric development and licensing procedures.

3110 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the economic impact of tourism.

235 Russell Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

318 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

*Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To resume joint hearings with House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on proposed legislation establishing employment training policies.

4232 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 26

9:30 a.m.

*Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on proposed legislation establishing employment training policies.

2175 Rayburn Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Assistant Secretary for Health, scientific activities overseas, and retirement pay for commissioned officers, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Centers for Disease Control, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the impact of stress on the family caused by the workplace.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the Federal Government in the operation of American payment systems.
5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army Cemetery Expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and Consumer Information Center.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Social Security Administration and refugee programs, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for human

development services of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 9

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to resume consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 11

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.
*Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on expanding employment opportunities for older workers.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 15

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for elementary and secondary education and education block grant programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the extended family.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program).
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for impact aid, vocational and adult education, libraries and learning resources programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for student financial assistance, student loan insurance, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loan and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training activities overseas, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE), and education statistics, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for special

institutions, Howard University, departmental management (salaries and expenses), and the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Veterans' Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of sex education programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on promoting voluntarism in America.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Selective Service System.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 14

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health, and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health, and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Council on Environmental Quality.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health, and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health, and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 20

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of title X of the Public

Health Service Act relating to the health aspects of teenage sexual activity.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management services, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Science Foundation.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on community social support systems.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 11

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Building Sciences, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and National Credit Union Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1982

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983

for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

1224 Dirksen Building